

MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES

EDITED BY

JAMES WILSON BRIGHT, *Editor-in-Chief*

GUSTAV GRUENBAUM

WILLIAM KURRELMAYER

H. CARRINGTON LANCASTER

CONTENTS

WELLS, W. H.—Chaucer as a Literary Critic,	255
FICHTER, W. L.—Notes on the Chronology of Lope de Vega's 'Comedias,'	269
BROOKS, N. C.—Notes on Performances of French Mystery Plays,	276
FESS, G. M.—Meléndez Valdér's 'Vanidad de las Quejas del Hombre contra su Hacedor' and the 'Pensées' of Pascal,	283
GREENE, G. S.—A new Date for George Wilkins's 'Three Miseries of Barbary,'	295

Reviews:—

CHAUNCEY B. TINKER, <i>Nature's Simple Plan.</i> [E. S. Crane]	291
LEOPOLD LACOUR, <i>Les premières actrices françaises.</i> [H. C. Lancaster.]	297
O. E. LESSING, <i>Geschichte der deutschen Literatur in ihren Grundzügen.</i> [E. H. Zeydel.]	301
PIERRE DE BACOURT and J. W. CUNLIFFE, <i>French Literature during the Last Half-Century.</i> [G. Chinard.]	305

Correspondence:—

PARRY, J. J., An Arthurian Parallel,	307
BULLOCK, W. L., Some Notes to a Note,	309
CAMPBELL, T. M., A Correction,	311
PECK, W. E., On the Origin of the Shelley Society (Postscript),	312

Brief Mention:—

JOHANNES BOLTE, <i>Johannes Pauli's Schimpf und Ernst</i> ;—GUSTAVE RUDLER, <i>Les techniques de la critique et de l'histoire littéraires en littérature française moderne</i> ;—H. J. CHAYTOR, <i>The Troubadours and England</i> ,	314
--	-----

THE JOHNS HOPKINS PRESS
 BALTIMORE

Eight Numbers a Year—Single Copy (Current) Sixty-five Cents

Entered as Second-Class Matter at the Baltimore, Maryland, Postoffice

Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103,
 Act of October 3, 1917. Authorized on July 9, 1918

MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES

**A MONTHLY PUBLICATION with inter-
mission from July to October (inclusive)**

This publication is devoted to linguistic and literary research and to aesthetic and philosophic criticism in the domain of English, German, and the related Germanic Languages; and of French, Italian, Spanish, and the other Languages of the Romance Group. Its purpose is also to promote sound methods in the teaching of the Modern Languages and Literatures.

The Subscription Price of the current annual volume is
\$5.00 for the United States and Mexico; Canada \$5.25
and \$5.50 for other countries included in the Postal Union.

Contributors and Publishers will please address matter for the English Department of the *Notes* to James W. Bright; for the German Department to William Kurrelmeyer; for the French Department to H. Carrington Lancaster; for the Italian and Spanish Departments to Gustav Gruenbaum. Other matter may be sent to the Editor-in-Chief. The address of all the editors is Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md.

Subscriptions and other business communications should be sent to the Johns Hopkins Press, Baltimore, Md.

PREPARATION OF COPY

All copy should be in typewritten form.

Underscore (for italics) all titles of books, periodicals, poems, plays and other separately published compositions.

Use numerals in designating foot-notes, and number foot-notes in unbroken sequence.

Use roman numerals for volume-reference, set off by a comma before a following page-reference.

OXFORD JUNIOR GERMAN SERIES

Under the general editorship of Rev. W. H. DAVID with Questionnaire, Direct Method Exercises and short Notes in German. With or without German-English Vocabulary. 70c. each.

In the Oxford Junior German Series there is unity of treatment in the Questionnaires, Grammatical Exercises, Notes and Vocabularies and both Questionnaires and Grammatical Exercises have been framed on simple lines, designed to elicit prompt and unstudied answers.

A NEW ADDITION

Die Regentrude und andere Erzählungen von Theodor Storm. Herausgegeben von Elisabeth Joachim.

PREVIOUSLY PUBLISHED

Das grüne Haus, by Dehmel. Edited by C. R. Ash.

Leodegar der Hirtenschüler, by Villingier. Edited by C. W. Merryweather.

Till Eulenspiegel, nach der Bearbeitung von Karl Simrock, edited by M. L. Seebohm.

Umzingelt, Der Richtungspunkt, zwei Kriegsnovellen, by Liliencron. Edited by A. M. D. Hughes.

Wolfdietrich, by Klausmann. Edited by H. E. Adams.

Der Geisterseher von Friedrich von Schiller herausgegeben von H. A. Cotton.

Der Onkel aus Pommern, Zwei Komoresken, by Ernst von Wildenbruch, herausgegeben von Karl Wichmann.

Siegfried, nach Schalk's Deutschen Heldensagen, adapted and edited by A. E. Wilson and A. Meyrick.

Roland und Beowulf: Zwei Heldengeschichten, edited by H. E. G. Tyndale.



OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS

American Branch

35 WEST 32ND STREET, NEW YORK



MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES

VOLUME XXXIX

MAY, 1924

NUMBER 5

CHAUCEER AS A LITERARY CRITIC

Chaucer's consideration of himself as the author of his works and his conscious responsibility for their matter and technique are aspects of his poetry that have received a long neglect at the hands of critics. Mention of the poems in the Prologue to *The Legend of Good Women*,¹ the Man of Law's Prologue,² and the Apology and the Retraction,³ is in itself sufficient indication of some such self-consciousness; yet, with the exception of very few scholars,⁴ this point of view has been entirely lost sight of. To one reading the poems at all closely, much evidence stands forth; for Chaucer gives specific criticism, not only of his own work, but of that of his contemporaries and of the classical writers as well. Also, throughout the poems one may trace definite ideas regarding narrative technique and style.

To point out these criticisms and ideas is the purpose of this article, avoiding, for the sake of brevity, all but the main implications. Accordingly, no attempt will be made to ally Chaucer with his contemporaries, or to show the indebtedness of his ideas to any of the writers before his time. By itself, his testimony constructs a Minos' maze sufficient for the present page.

¹ *L.*, 254, 414.

² *B.*, 46 ff.

³ *I.*, 1084 ff.

⁴ Miss Hammond in her *Chaucer, A Bibliographical Manual*, N. Y., 1908, pp. 158, 259, 261, calls attention to this neglect. Courthope, *History of English Poetry*, N. Y., 1895, vol. I, pp. 259-260, Saintsbury, *History of Criticism*, London, 1900, vol. I, pp. 450-451, and Manly, *Mod. Phil.*, VIII, pp. 141 ff., adopt the attitude in connection with the *Sir Thopas*, as Professor Hart does to some extent in discussing the *Franklin's Tale*, *Haverford Essays*, Haverford, 1909, p. 185 ff.

First, his love of books becomes apparent in the earliest poems. In *The Book of the Duchess*, he tells us that

Upon my bedde I sat upright,
And bad oon reche me a book,
A romaunce, and he hit me took
To rede and dryve the night away;
For me thoghte it better play
Then playen either at chesse or tables.⁵

and in *The Parlement of Foules*,

. . . . other bokes took me to
To rede upon, and yet I rede alway.⁶

In *The House of Fame*, the eagle reminds Chaucer that after his day of labor over account books,

Thou sittest at another boke,
Til fully daswed is thy loke.⁷

Both for the sake of pleasure and of learning, he tells us, is this habit,⁸ and becomes most definite in his Prologue to the *Legend of Good Women*,⁹ claiming that the Sabbath and 'the joly time of May' are the only occasions that can ween him from those books to which he gives such faith and credence.

Despite these passages, such facts might well have been surmised from the occasional bits occurring throughout his work. There is the well-known and affectionate description of the clerk,¹⁰ for instance, and that moment in the *Troilus* when Pandarus

. . . . took a light, and fond his contenance
As for to loke up-on an old romaunce.¹¹

But books, says Chaucer, aside from giving pleasure, teach of past ages 'whyl men loved the lawe of kinde'¹² and provide the

⁵ *BD.*, 46 ff.

⁶ *PF.*, 695 ff.

⁷ *HF.*, 657 ff.

⁸ *PF.*, 15 ff.:

Of usage, what for luste what for lore,
On bokes rede I ofte, as I yow tolde.

⁹ *L.*, 29 ff.

¹⁰ *A.*, 293 ff.

¹¹ *TC.*, III, 979 ff.

¹² *BD.*, 56 ff.

opportunities 'wher-with to scoleye.'¹³ To a book he goes 'a certeyn thing to lerne,'¹⁴ in the hope to create from its lore the thing he contemplates.

For out of olde felde, as men seith,
Cometh al this newe corn fro yeer to yere;
And out of olde bokes, in good feith,
Cometh al this newe science that men lere.¹⁵

This, then, is Chaucer's employment of reading, and may well be considered the argument for his translation and use of the work of other authors.

Of these authors, themselves, Chaucer does not leave us in doubt. Vergil, Ovid, Homer, Lucan, and Statius, we may believe, constitute the select company of his highest admiration, since it is they whose steps he hopes the humble *Troilus and Criseyde* may kiss.¹⁶ All these, too, have their pillars in the House of Fame,¹⁷ but unfortunately the poet is sparing of pointing out just wherein he believes their excellence to consist. Accordingly, we must be content with an occasional commendatory phrase. Thus

Glory and honour, Virgil Mantuan,
Be to thy name! and I shal, as I can,
Folow thy lantern, as thou gost biforn.¹⁸

¹³ L., 17 ff.:

Than mote we to bokes that we finde,
Through which that olde thinges been in minde,
And to the doctrine of these olde wyse,
Yeven credence, in every skilful wyse,
And trowen on these olde approved stories
Of holinesse, of regnes, of victories,
Of love, of hate, of other sundry thinges,
Of whiche I may not maken rehersinges.
And if that olde bokes were a-weye,
Y-loren were of remembraunce the keye.
Wel oghte us than on olde bokes love,
Ther-as ther is non other assay by preve.

¹⁴ PF., 20.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, 22 ff.

¹⁶ TC., iv, 1791 ff.

¹⁷ HF., 1455 ff.

¹⁸ L., 924 ff. The significance, in *The Hous of Fame* (ll. 1481-1485), of Homer's iron pillar becoming tinned for Vergil has been explained by Miss Elizabeth Nitchie: *Vergil and the English Poets*, N. Y. 1919; p. 59.

Ovid is

. . . . Venus clerk
That hath y-sowen wonder wyde
The grete god of Loves name,¹⁹

and there are compliments, too, to Ovid's tale of Ceyx and Aleyone, 'that me thoughte a wonder thing,'²⁰ in the *Book of the Duchess*; for

Such sorwe this lady to her took
That trewely I, which made this book,
Had swich pite and swich rowthe
To rede hir sorwe, that, by my trowthe,
I ferde the worse al the morwe
After, to thenken on her sorwe,²¹

a delicate tribute to Ovid's power. The same author is apostrophized as 'noble'²² by the Merchant, and extended similar praise throughout *The Legend of Good Women*.²³ For criticism of Homer, 'the gret Omeer'²⁴ must suffice. Similarly, 'the grete poete'²⁵ is the only judgment given us concerning Lucan.

In the wake of these five, come minor lights. 'Th' Ebrayk Josephus'²⁷ Dares, Dictes, 'Lollius,' Guido, Geoffrey²⁸ ('betwix hem was a litel envye' of Homer), and Claudius²⁹ also have their places in the *House of Fame* with 'an othere many mo.' In this poem, too, Marcian and Aleynus are playfully lauded for the truth of their descriptions of the heavens,³⁰ although the former comes in for later disapproval at the tongue of the Merchant.³¹ Plato is judged as 'wyse'³² and Juvenal's verity and insight are praised in the *Troilus*.³³ Theophrastus is flouted by January in the *Merchant's Tale*,³⁴ but since the condemnation is twice removed from Chaucer himself, it is hardly to be accepted as evidence of his own opinion. In the *Legend of Hypsipyle*, Valerius Flaccus is

¹⁹ *HF.*, 1487 ff.

²⁰ *BD.*, 61; cf. also, *Ibid.*, 221-230. ²⁷ *Ibid.*, 1433.

²¹ *Ibid.*, 95 ff.

²⁸ *Ibid.*, 1467 ff.

²² *E.*, 2125.

²⁹ *Ibid.*, 1507 ff.

²³ *L.*, 1367, 1678.

³⁰ *Ibid.*, 985 ff.

²⁴ *HF.*, 1466.

³¹ *E.*, 1732 ff.

²⁵ *Ibid.*, 1499.

³² *H.*, 207.

²⁶ *TC.*, iv, 197 ff.; cf. also *D.*, 1191-1192.

²⁷ *E.*, 1295 ff.

rebuked for the length of the *Argonauticon* and for his insertion of extraneous matter.³⁵ There is a sly hit at Geoffrey de Vinsauf in the *Nun's Priest's Tale*.³⁶ Cicero's *Somnium Scipionis*, Chaucer tells us

To rede forth hit gan me so delyte
That al the day me thoughte but a lyte,³⁷

and the monk adjures the pilgrims to read

. . . . the grete poete of Itaille,
That highte Dant, for he can al devyse
Fro point to point, nat o word wol he faille.³⁸

Concerning his immediate contemporaries, Chaucer is a little less slight. He yields to Boccaccio in the *Troilus and Criseyde* lines

But sooth is, though I can not tellen al,
As can myn auctor, of his excellence,
Yet have I seyde, and, god to-forn, I shal
In every thing al hoolly his sentence.³⁹

and would seem to reflect, whimsically, upon Gower in the Introduction to the *Man of Law's Prologue*.⁴⁰ The story of Canace

That lovede hir owne brother sinfully
Of swiche cursed stories I sey 'fy',⁴¹

and that of Apollonius of Tyre is dismissed as 'so horrible a tale for to rede.'⁴² Chaucer's avowal that he

Nolde never wryte in none of his sermons
Of swiche unkinde abhominaciouns⁴³

leads us not only to temper his apostrophe of 'O moral Gower'⁴⁴ at the conclusion of *Troilus and Criseyde*, but implies a standard of tale-telling in general that will be mentioned later.⁴⁵

Petrarch, too, comes in for censure in the *Clerk's Prologue*;⁴⁶ and although this is

. a worthy clerk
. . . whose rethoryke sweete

³⁵ L., 1456 ff.

³⁶ B., 4537-4541.

³⁷ PF., 27 ff.

³⁸ B., 3650 ff.

³⁹ TC., III, 1324 ff.

⁴⁰ B., 77 ff.

⁴¹ B., 79-80.

⁴² B., 84.

⁴³ B., 87-88.

⁴⁴ TC., v, 1856.

⁴⁵ Cf. below, p. 264.

⁴⁶ E., 26 ff.

Enlumined al Itaille of poetrye,
As Linian dide of philosophye
Or lawe, or other art particuler,⁴⁷

nevertheless, he is frowned upon for using the 'heigh style,'⁴⁸ particularly in the proem to the Griselda story which the clerk considers irrelevant unless it be that Petrarch wishes to impart mere information.

Some slight mention of Chaucer's consideration of his own work has been made above.⁴⁹ In the Prologue to the *Legend of Good Women*,⁵⁰ he counters the accusation that the *Romance of the Rose* and *Troilus and Criseyde* are heresies against love's law with a list of his other works, and has Alceste say of him

But wel I wot, with that he can endyte,
He hath maked lewed folk delyte
To serve you, in preysing of your name.⁵¹

In the Apology and Retraction, again, he mentions his work, seeming to regret his 'translacions and endytinges of worldly vanitees,'⁵² and would have to his account only 'the translacion of Boece de Consolacione, and othere bokes of Legendes of seintes, and omelies, and moralitee, and devocioun.'⁵³ How seriously this is to be taken, or under what influences it was written, are questions that lie outside this present pale. The Man of Law's mention of Chaucer in the Introduction to the Prologue of his tale is quite different. He tells us that

. . . Chaucer, though he can but lewedly
On metres and on ryming craftily,
Hath seyde . . . in swich English as he can
. . . . of loveres up and down
Mo than Ovyde made of mencionioun.⁵⁴

Following on this depreciation of his skill, however, which as Root

⁴⁷ E., 27 ff.

⁴⁹ Cf. above, pp. 1, 6.

⁴⁸ E., 41, 1148.

⁵⁰ L., 254 ff.

⁵¹ Ibid., 402 ff.; cf. also HF., 633 ff.:

In thy studie so thou wrytest,
And ever-mo of love endytest,
In honour of him . . .

⁵² I., 1085 ff.

⁵³ I., 1087 ff.

⁵⁴ B., 47 ff.

suggests⁵⁵ may best be laid to a half-humorous modesty on the part of the poet rather than to any dramatic representation of the opinion of the Man of Law, comes his emphatic condemnation of the *Confessio Amantis* stories, which he

Nolde never wryte in none of his sermons.⁵⁶

Elsewhere, we have hints of Chaucer's ideas concerning his abilities, and a like modesty shines through the words of the eagle in the *Hous of Fame*,

'That thou so longe . . . hast set thy wit—
Although that in thy hede ful lyte is—
To make bokes, songes, dytees,
In ryme, or elles in cadence,
As thou best canst, in reverence
Of Love . . .'⁵⁷

When asked later in the poem

'Artow come hider to han fame?'

he replies, however, that

'Suffyceth me, as I were deed,
That no wight have me name in honde.
I woot my-self best how I stonde;
For what I drye or what I thinke
I wol my-selven al hit drinke,
Certeyn, for the more part:
As ferforth as I can myn art,'⁵⁸

a more serious judgment based upon his own standards. *Troilus and Criseyde*, he tells us, attempts not to rival other poems, but must

. . . subgit be to alle poesye,⁵⁹

and once before, in the same poem, we notice that he modestly pleads guilty to the charge of inadequacy when describing the woe of Criseyde.⁶⁰ In the Prologue to the *Legend of Good Women*,⁶¹ he yields place and apologies to the French poets of courtly love,

⁵⁵ R. K. Root, *The Poetry of Chaucer*, N. Y., 1922, p. 181, note 2.

⁵⁶ B., 87.

⁵⁷ HF., 615 ff.

⁵⁸ HF., 1872 ff.

⁵⁹ TC., v, 1790 ff.

⁶⁰ Ibid., iv, 801 ff.

⁶¹ L., 63 ff.

. . . I come after, glening here and there,
And am ful glad if I may finde an ere
Of any goodly word that they han left,⁶²

and as a result of this modesty, most endeavours on our part to ferret out a just self-criticism of his work are baffled.⁶³

However, regarding the tenets of narrative art in general, Chaucer is more explicit. To be sure, he has left no definite statements concerning art and its functions. The maxim of Hippocrates we find twisted in meaning and applied to love,⁶⁴ and the one lone, bare statement that 'craft countrefeteth kinde'⁶⁵ is imitated from the *Roman de la Rose*.⁶⁶ However, that Chaucer considered sincerity—that dogma of the artist from Aristotle to Conrad—as essential to his poetry, there can be little doubt. Such is his prayer in the proem to the *Troilus*,

And eek for me preyeth to god so dere,
That I have might to shewe, in som manere,
Everich a word, if it be in his charge,
In Troilus unsely aventure,⁶⁶

and he brings it forth even more forcibly in the Prologue to the *Canterbury Tales*:

For this ye knowen al-so wel as I,
Who-so shal telle a tale after a man,
He moot reherce, as ny as ever he can,
Everich a word, if it be in his charge,
Al speke he never so rudeliche and large;
Or elles he moot telle his tale untrewe,
Or feyne thing, or finde wordes newe.
He may nat spare, al-thogh he were his brother;
He moot as wel seye o word as another.⁶⁷

This note is struck again in the *Miller's Prologue*, for

. . . I moot reherce
Hir tales alle, be they bettre or werse,
Or elles falsen som of my matere,⁶⁸

⁶² *Ibid.*

⁶³ Cf. *Envoy to Scogan*, 34 ff.; *BD.*, 1330-1334; *A.*, 1459-1461.

⁶⁴ *PF.*, 1 ff.

⁶⁵ *HF.*, 1213.

⁶⁶ Cf. *Roman de la Rose*, l. 16233.

⁶⁷ *TC.*, I, 32 ff.; cf. also, *HF.*, 523 ff. and the various invocations to this poem.

⁶⁸ *A.*, 730 ff.

⁶⁹ *A.*, 3173 ff.

and in the *Maunciple's Tale*

The word mot nede accorde with the dede.
If men shal telle properly a thing,
The word mot cosin be to the werking.⁶⁹

That the same holds true toward the authors whom he translates, we have, once more, abundant evidence. He will not falsify their material, any more than he would his own. In *Troilus and Criseyde*, for instance,

I can no more, but of thise ilke tweye,
To whom this tale suere be or soot,
Though that I tarie a yeer, som-tyme I moot
After myn auctor, tellen hir gladnesse,
As wel as I have told hir hevinesse.⁷⁰

In the same poem, and for the same reason,—‘thus seith the book’—he beseeches

. . . every lady bright of hewe,
And every gentil womman, what she be,
That al be that Criseyde was untrewed,
That for that gilt she be not wrooth with me.
Ye may hir gilt in othere bokes see.⁷¹

At times, to be sure, he allows a thought of his own to intrude, but catches it back with immediate reference to his author. Thus, somewhat deliciously, in the *Legend of Dido* when she and Aeneas have sought refuge in the cave,

I noot, with hem if ther wente any mo;
The autour maketh of hit no mencoun.⁷²

⁶⁹ *H.*, 208 ff.

⁷⁰ *TC.*, III, 1193 ff.; cf. also, *G.*, 24-25, 79-84.

⁷¹ *TC.*, v, 1772 ff.

⁷² *L.*, 1227 ff.; cf. also, *TC.*, I, 393 ff.; *Ibid.*, II, 699 ff.; *Ibid.*, III, 575 ff.; *Ibid.*, IV, 1415 ff.; *L.*, 1021 ff.; *Ibid.*, 1721. Chaucer may, however, deliberately lead us astray. In the *Troilus*, for instance, concerning his heroine:

. . whether that she children hadde or noon,
I rede it nought; therefore I lete it goon,

(I, 132 ff.)

whereas his author, Boccaccio, did tell of her children! Cf. Chaucer's ascription of the account of Emily's sacrifice to Statius (*A* 2294), and his denial of knowledge concerning the flight of Arcite's soul (*A* 2810 ff.).

Chaucer, also, had quite clear conceptions of various literary types. The monk defines tragedy as a story of one of high estate fallen into misery, and that must end unhappily.⁷⁴ Such is Chaucer's own classification of the *Troilus and Criseyde*—

Go, litel book, go litel my tregedie⁷⁵

with its following hope that its author may some day write in comedy.⁷⁶ This latter, we may take as being defined for us by the knight (who, with the host, finds fault with the tragic type) when he says

. . . the contrarie is joie and greet solas,
As whan a man hath been in povre estaat,
And clymbeth up, and wexeth fortunat,
And ther abyde in prosperitee.⁷⁷

Mars, in the proem of his complaint,⁷⁸ expounds the necessities of the correct 'ordre of compleynt,' much as the Pardoner makes plain the requirements of a sermon.⁷⁹ The Parson holds distinction between fable and sermon,⁸⁰ as does Chaucer between those tales of the Canterbury cycle 'that sounen into sinne'⁸¹ and those

. . . that toucheth gentillesse
And eek moralitee and holinesse.⁸²

Hence, the Miller and the Reeve, he says, tell tales of the former type,⁸³ whereas that of the Knight⁸⁴ and Chaucer's *Tale of Melibeus*⁸⁵ are of the latter. Tales such as Gower's, already referred to,⁸⁶ are 'unkinde abhominaciouns' and not to be written by Chaucer. Courthope, Saintsbury, and Manly have pointed out the implied criticism of romance-writers in the *Sir Thopas*.⁸⁷

⁷⁴ B., 3161 ff.

⁷⁵ TC., v, 1786.

⁷⁶ Ibid., 1787 ff.

⁷⁷ B., 3964 ff.

⁷⁸ CM., 155 ff.

⁸⁴ Ibid., 3109 ff.:

⁷⁹ C., 329 ff.

⁸⁰ I., 31 ff.

⁸¹ Ibid., 1087.

⁸² A., 3179 ff.

⁸³ Ibid., 3182 ff.

. . . nas ther yong ne old
That he ne seyde it was a noble storie.

⁸⁵ B., 2130:

It is a moral tale vertuous

⁸⁶ Cf. above, p. 259.

⁸⁷ Cf. above, note 4.

As for the technique of the tale, itself, we can surmise some of his requirements. The charge of prolixity that is often brought against Chaucer, he answers in the *Troilus and Criseyde*,

But flee we now prolixitee best is,
For love of god, and lat us faste go
Right to the effect, with-oute tales mo,
Why al this folk assembled in this place;
And lat us of hir saluinges pace,⁸⁸

and later,

But al passe I, lest ye to longe dwelle;
For for o fyn is al that ever I telle.⁸⁹

It was prolixity, too, for which he criticized Flaccus,⁹⁰ and on similar ground the Clerk takes exception to Petrarch.⁹¹ The effect's the thing, as Pandarus knew—'th' ende is every tales strengthe.'⁹² A tale is all for some conclusion. The Knight cuts short his description of Theseus' entertainment for this reason,⁹³ as he did his account of the fight in the grove⁹⁴ and does later with the discourse of the gods.⁹⁵ 'The fruit of every tale is for to seye'⁹⁶ claims the Man of Law, and in the *Legend of Cleopatra*⁹⁷ the same plea is made. One finds it recurring throughout the poems.⁹⁸

In aid of this 'effecte,' Chaucer would cut out all extraneous matter. What Alcione said in her swoon is forbidden us.⁹⁹ Simi-

⁸⁸ *TC.*, II, 1564 ff.

⁸⁹ *Ibid.* 1595-1596.

⁹⁰ Cf. above, p. 6.

⁹¹ Cf. above, p. 7.

⁹² *TC.*, II, 258 ff.

⁹³ *A.*, 2206:

Of al this make I now no mencoun;
But al th'effect, that thinketh me the beste;
Now comth the poynt . . .

⁹⁴ *Ibid.*, 1187 ff.

⁹⁵ *Ibid.*, 2479 ff.

⁹⁶ *B.*, 706.

⁹⁷ *L.*, 622:

And forthy to th'effect than wol I skippe,
And al the remenant, I wol lete hit slippe.

⁹⁸ Cf. *TC.*, III, 513; *Ibid.*, 604; *Ibid.*, 1676 ff.; *Ibid.*, IV, 15 ff.; *Ibid.*, V, 1031 ff.; *L.*, 2403; *A.*, 2919 ff., etc.

⁹⁹ *BD.*, 215 ff.

larly in the *Troilus*, the story of Troy

. . . how this toun com to destruccioun
Ne falleth nought to purpos me to telle;
For it were here a long digressioun
Fro my matere, and yow to longe dwelle.¹⁰⁰

The Friar complains that the preamble to the *Wife of Bath's Tale* is too long.¹⁰¹ Chaucer, himself, is continually afraid of sermonizing,¹⁰² and 'other things collateral' are cut away as not according to his matter. The evidence on this point is extremely profuse.¹⁰³

And for it is no fruit but los of tyme.¹⁰⁴

says the Squire; nor will the poet describe all that he sees in the House of Fame

. . . . I nil as now not ryme,
For ese of yow, and losse of tyme:
For tyme y-lost, this knowen ye,
By no way may recovered be.¹⁰⁵

The insertion of exempla, however, he will admit. As the Pardoner says

Than telle I hem ensamples many oon
Of olde stories, longe tym agoon:
For lewed peple loven tales olde;
Swich thinges can they wel reporte and holde.¹⁰⁶

But the Knight makes plain, that here also, there must be moderation,¹⁰⁷ and, consequently, omits his illustrative tale of Perotheus

¹⁰⁰ *TC.*, i, 141 ff.

¹⁰¹ *D.*, 829 ff.

¹⁰² *TC.*, ii, 965 ff.; *Ibid.*, 1299; *L.*, 1184; *Ibid.*, 2025; *CM.*, 209.

¹⁰³ The following are among the most obvious: *PF.*, 326; *HF.*, 1299 ff.; *Ibid.*, 1341 ff.; *TC.*, v, 1765 ff.; *L.*, 953 ff.; *A.*, 994 ff.

¹⁰⁴ *F.*, 74.

¹⁰⁵ *HF.*, 1503 ff.; cf. also, *L.*, 570 ff.; *Ibid.*, 995 ff.; *Ibid.*, 1002 ff.; *Ibid.*, 1552 ff.; *Ibid.*, 1920 ff.; etc.; *A.*, 1189 ff.; *Ibid.*, 1380; *B.*, 374.

¹⁰⁶ *C.*, 435 ff.

¹⁰⁷ *A.*, 1953 ff.:

Suffyceth heer ensamples oon or two,
And though I coude rekne a thousand mo.

and *Ibid.*, 2039:

Suffyceth oon ensample in stories olde.

and Theseus.¹⁰⁸ For him, as for Kipling, that is another story. That there is no need to tell more of the exemplum than that part that bears on the point in hand is illustrated by the Wife of Bath's tale of Midas' wife, with its abrupt curtailment,

The remenant of the tale if ye wol here,
Redeth Ovyde, and ther ye may it lere.¹⁰⁹

Concerning style, Chaucer again has his distinctions. The Miller and the Reeve are churls as are many of the other pilgrims,

And harlotrye they tolden bothe two,¹¹⁰

the poet apologizing for 'hir wordes and hir chere.'¹¹¹ In *Troilus and Criseyde* a similar consistency is shown.¹¹² The host adjures the Clerk not to preach or tell a dull story, but to speak intelligibly and to keep his pedantic terms, fine phrases ('colours'), and figures of speech until that time he would write in the high style for kings.¹¹³ It is for using the high style, however, that the Clerk partly blames Petrarch,¹¹⁴ although the Franklin apologizes because

Colours ne knowe I none.¹¹⁵

Again, the eagle speaks deprecatingly of them in the *House of Fame*,¹¹⁶ but there is a hint of Chaucer's conscious use of such rhetorical devices in the *Troilus* when he writes

The dayes honour, and the hevenes eye,
The nightes fo, al this clepe I the sonne,¹¹⁷

and in the *Franklin's Tale*

For th'orisonte hath reft the sonne his light;
This is as muche to seye as it was night.¹¹⁸

Chaucer's interest in metrics has been already noticed in the

¹⁰⁸ *Ibid.*, 1201.

¹⁰⁹ *D.*, 981 ff.

¹¹⁰ *A.*, 3184; cf. also 3169.

¹¹¹ *A.*, 728.

¹¹² *TC.*, I, 12 ff.:

. . . to a sorwful tale, a sory chere.

¹¹³ *E.*, 12 ff.

¹¹⁶ *HF.*, 855 ff.

¹¹⁴ *Ibid.*, 41, 1148.

¹¹⁷ *TC.*, II, 904 ff.

¹¹⁵ *F.*, 723.

¹¹⁸ *F.*, 1017 ff.

criticism of the Man of Law.¹¹⁹ In the *House of Fame*, he says that

Though som vers faile in a sillable;
 I do no diligence
 To shewe craft, but o sentence.¹²⁰

Tragedies, says the Monk,

. ben versifyed comunly
 Of six feet, which men clepe *exametron*.¹²¹

The host calls the 'drasty ryming' of Sir Thopas, 'rym dogeral,'¹²² and consigns it to the devil.

This, then, may finish an all too brief discussion of Chaucer's concern with matters of literary technique. It will suffice, I believe, to point out very definite indication of the poet's tendencies and interests in these fields. For us, it may not only serve to throw some little light on what Professor Mead calls 'the true Chaucer, working in his own way, and controlling his sources instead of being partly controlled by them,'¹²³ but on the beginnings of English literary criticism as well.

WHITNEY HASTINGS WELLS.

Harvard University.

NOTES ON THE CHRONOLOGY OF LOPE DE VEGA'S *COMEDIAS*

One of the greatest handicaps in the way of understanding the development of Lope de Vega's and the seventeenth-century Spanish theatre in general has been the lack of definite knowledge of the dates of many of the plays. The material has been so vast and has come down to us in so imperfect a form, that the task has not been an easy one. Where there are no autograph manuscripts, it has often been possible, it is true, to determine the date by internal evidence, such as references to contemporary events. The versification has also served at times to indicate the period in which a play was written, although only within broad limits. But

¹¹⁹ Cf. above, p. 8.

¹²⁰ *HF.*, 1098 ff.

¹²¹ *B.*, 3169.

¹²² *Ibid.*, 2109 ff.

¹²³ *P. M. L. A.*, xvi, p. 388.

with the exception of the investigations of Professor S. G. Morley¹ and more recently of Professor M. A. Buchanan,² no serious and sustained efforts have been made as yet to study the versification of individual playwrights in the hope of discovering, if possible, the general characteristics and peculiar marks of their work, and the trend in the use of the different metres. Professor Buchanan, in the pamphlet just referred to, has studied the versification of almost one hundred of Lope's plays that could be accurately or approximately dated, so as to get some criteria that would help in fixing the chronology of the remaining undated plays.

As the value of these criteria will be increased with the number of plays on which they are based, I submit the following data on a number of Lope's comedias that might be added to Professor Buchanan's list, together with the reasons for ascribing the dates given. It is with some hesitancy that I include plays on the basis of reference to historical events, for it is quite possible that such references were interpolated later. Still one is justified in admitting plays on this basis, so long as the versification is in accordance with that of other plays of the same date.

El Cerco de Santa Fe, 1587?-98? Restori supposes this *comedia* to have been written after 1587.³ It contains a speech in which mention is made of several Spanish kings up to and including Philip II;⁴ hence I suppose it to be not later than 1598. The presence of the allegorical personages of España and Fama might indicate an early date, though not necessarily (*cf.* the figure of España in *El mejor mozo de España*, written 1611). Published 1604, this is one of the very few plays which up to that time contained *décimas* (abba: accdde).

El casamiento en la muerte, 1598?-1604. Contains reference to Philip III.⁵ Published 1604 (Part I).

Los tres diamantes, 1599-1602. Belardo and Lucinda (Micaela Luján) are among the characters. References to Lucinda in

¹ *Studies in Spanish Dramatic Versification of the Siglo de Oro*. Alarcón and Moreto. University of California Publications in Modern Philology, VII (1918), n. 3, 131-173.

² *The Chronology of Lope de Vega's Plays*, 1922; No. 6, Philological Series, University of Toronto Studies.

³ *Cf.* Rennert y Castro, *Vida de Lope de Vega*, p. 469.

⁴ *Obras de Lope de Vega* (edited by Menéndez Pelayo), Acad., XI, 256*.

⁵ Acad., VII, 277*.

Lope's work begin in 1599.⁶ A. Castro places this play before 1602.⁷ Published 1609 (Part II).

La ocasión perdida, 1599-1603. Another Belardo-Lucinda play.⁸ Cited in P (1603); published 1609 (Part II).

Los embustes de Celauro, 1599-1603. Lucinda does not appear here, but is spoken of.⁹ We might suppose, from the nature of the references to her, that this play belonged to the last year or two of the period indicated, when Lope's relations with Micaela were happiest and most intense.¹⁰ Cited in P; published 1614 (Part IV).

Lucinda perseguida, 1599-1603. Another Belardo-Lucinda comedia.¹¹ Cited in P; published 1621 (Part XVII).

Los esclavos libres, 1599-1603? Lucinda Luján (!), the heroine, praised for her beauty and *ingenio*.¹² Cited in P; published in 1620 (Part XIII), shortly before which time it was retouched.¹³

El caballero de Illescas, 1601?-03. Belardo praises Lucinda¹⁴ and relates his unhappiness at not being in Andalusia with his loved one.¹⁵ We know that Lope was with Micaela in Seville at different times during 1601-04.¹⁶ Cited in P; published 1620 (Part XIV).

El secretario de sí mismo, 1604?-05? Another Belardo-Lucinda play. Castro supposes its date to be not much later than 1604.¹⁷ Cited in P² (1618).

El hombre de bien, 1605?-08? Jacinto (= Lope) and Lucinda

⁶ Cf. Américo Castro, *Alusiones a Micaela Luján en las obras de Lope de Vega*, in *Revista de filología española*, V (1918), 259.

⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 261.

⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 266.

⁹ *Comedias escogidas de Lope de Vega*, in *Biblioteca de autores españoles*, XXIV, 104^b, 107^a.

¹⁰ *Rev. fil. esp.*, V, 261, 268. This play is not quoted by Castro, however.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, V, 263.

¹² *Obras de Lope de Vega* (edited by Cotarelo); Acad. N. (Nueva edición), V, 408^a. *Ingenio* in this passage must be taken to mean Micaela's talent as an actress, and not culture. Cf. A. Castro, *Rev. fil. esp.*, V, 270; Castro does not, however, include this play in his study.

¹³ Acad., N., V, p. XXIV.

¹⁴ Acad., N., IV, 138^a, 139^b.

¹⁵ Acad., N., JV, 136^b.

¹⁶ Rennert y Castro, *op. cit.*, pp. 148-9.

¹⁷ *Rev. fil. esp.*, V, 278.

appear. A statement by the latter,¹⁸ seems to indicate that the date of this play falls about six years after the beginning of Lope's and Micaela's love-affair.¹⁹ Cited in P²; published in 1615 (Part VI).

El castigo del discreto, 1606?-12? Internal evidence shows it to have been written before 1612 and after 1598, either in 1598-1601 or 1606-12. I am inclined to favor the latter date.²⁰ Cited in P².

La hermosa Ester, 1610. Autograph Ms. in British Museum.

La burgalesa de Lerma, 1613? A manuscript (copy) exists, dated Nov. 30, 1613. The original could not have been written much earlier, if the statement made in the play by Belardo concerning Julia's death is an allusion to the death of his wife, Juana de Guardo (died Aug. 13, 1613).²¹ In the same scene Belardo speaks in a way that points without doubt to his decision to enter the priesthood. This allows us to correct the statement made by Rennert²² and Castro²³ that Lope did not make this decision until 1614. Cotarelo, on the other hand, makes the mistake of supposing that Lope had already taken orders when this play was written;²⁴ he was not ordained, as a matter of fact, until the spring of 1614.²⁵

El animal de Hungría, 1613?-1617. Lope refers here, as in the last play, to his intention of ceasing to write for the theatre.²⁶ The long speech of the rustic barber, who is here Lope's mouth-

¹⁸ "Con tal secreto me rendí ha seis años Del amor de Jacinto," etc. *Bib. aut. esp.*, LII, 193^a.

¹⁹ *Rev. fil. esp.*, V, 279-80.

²⁰ J. F. Montesinos, in an article published since this was written, supposes it to date from 1603-08. Cf. *Rev. fil. esp.* IX, 402-3. See my edition of the play to be published shortly.

²¹ *Acad.*, N., IV, 63^b.

²² *Life of Lope de Vega*, p. 210.

²³ *Vida de Lope de Vega*, p. 217.

²⁴ *Acad.*, N., IV, 64^a, n. 2.

²⁵ Rennert y Castro, *op. cit.*, p. 218.

²⁶ Just as in *La burgalesa de Lerma*, Belardo had said: "La pluma y papel rompí, Colgué a un sauce el instrumento" (*Acad.*, N., IV, 63^b), so here the barber declares: "Y aun las [historias] humanas muy presto También las pienso dejar" (*Acad.*, N., III, 425^b), and "Que quiero colgar la pluma, como otros cuelgan la espada" (*Acad.*, N., III, 426^a).

piece, is interesting besides for the defense it contains of his theatre and his claim to being the inventor of the *comedia*. Cited in P²; published 1617 (Part IX).

Los ramilletes de Madrid, 1615?-1618. Contains reference to the double marriage of Philip IV and Elizabeth and Louis XIII and Anne (1615).²⁷ Published in 1618 (Part XI).

Al pasar del arroyo, 1615?-1619. Contains description of the entrance into Madrid of Princess Elizabeth, wife of Philip IV, that took place Nov. 19, 1615.²⁸ (Professor Buchanan included this play in his earlier list in *MLN.*, 1909.) Cited in P²; published 1619 (Part XII).

La mayor desgracia de Carlos V, 1625?-32. According to Menéndez Pelayo, this play dates after 1625, because of the reference in it to the prophetic tolling of the bell of Velilla in that year.²⁹ Published 1632-33 (Part XXIV).

No son todos ruiseñores, 1630?-35. We read in this play of the marriage of Philip IV's sister, María, to the King of Hungary, heir to the Empire.³⁰ (She was married by proxy to the Prince of Guastalla, in Madrid, on Oct. 3, 1629.³¹) There is also reference to the birth of a son to Philip IV and Queen Elizabeth (Oct., 1629), and a description of the festival celebrating the Prince's baptism;³² also mention of María's departure for Hungary³³ and of her being accompanied part of the way through Spain by Philip IV, the Queen, and Philip's two brothers.³⁴ As Philip did not return to Madrid until the early part of 1630,³⁵ this play must have been written between then and 1635, when it was published in Part XXII.^{35a}

As an example of the way in which dates suggested for plays

²⁷ *Bib. aut. esp.*, LII, 314^a,^c.

²⁸ *Bib. aut. esp.*, XXIV, 393^b,^c, 394^a.

²⁹ *Acad.*, XII, p. LVI. Cf. Rennert y Castro, *op. cit.*, p. 495.

³⁰ *Acad.*, XV, 98^a.

³¹ Hume, *The Court of Philip IV*, p. 209.

³² *Acad.*, XV, 98^a.

³³ *Acad.*, XV, 98^b.

³⁴ *Acad.*, XV, 99^a.

³⁵ Hume, *op. cit.*, p. 221.

^{35a} I have since seen J. F. Montesinos' article in *Rev. fil. esp.*, IX, 30 ff. He dates it 1630.

on the basis of internal evidence may be checked up by their versification, I may refer to *En los indicios la culpa*, which is said to have been dated 1620 in the manuscript, now lost, that was formerly in the Osuna library.³⁶ The versification is *redond.*, 87%; *quint.*, 9%; *romance*, 4%; *décimas*, 1%; the very low percentage of *romance* does not correspond at all to Lope's practice at this time, as Professor Buchanan's schedule will show. I have wondered, therefore, whether 1620 might not be a slip for 1602. The versification would fit in very well with this date (cf. *El cordobés valeroso*, 1603: *redond.*, 74%; *quint.*, 5%; *romance*, 7%; etc.). The references in the play to the Christian martyrs in Japan would show it to date at least after 1597.

I should like to suggest the following changes in dates given by Professor Buchanan:

El gran duque de Moscovia, 1603?-08, instead of 1603?-13? Lope would hardly have written of Lucinda after 1608: "¡Qué bellísima mujer! ¡A cuanto mira sujeta! ¡Dichoso el que amaneciére Con tan bello sol al lado!"³⁷

El príncipe despeñado, 1602, not 1601-06. There is an autograph Ms.

El cordobés valeroso, 1603, not 1602-03. Autograph Ms.

El mayor imposible, 1615, not 1614.³⁸

El cuerdo loco, 1602, not 1601-06. Autograph Ms.

³⁶ Rennert y Castro, *op. cit.*, p. 479.

³⁷ *Bib. aut. esp.*, LII, 267^a. Cf. also *Rev. fil. esp.*, V, 279, and Rennert y Castro, *op. cit.*, p. 484.

³⁸ Rennert y Castro, *op. cit.*, p. 227.

SCHEDULE OF VERSIFICATION ³⁰

DATE	TITLE	Redondillas	Quintillas	Romance	Décimas	Octavas	Tercetos	Sueltos	Silvas	Sonetos	Liras	Miscellaneous	OPENING AND CLOSING VERSES IN EACH ACT
1587?-98?	El cerco de Santa Fe	47	21	13	3	11	5					(14) ⁴⁰ song	I. oct.-oct. II. re.-déc. III. oct.-q. I. oct.-re. II. re.-rom. III. re.-re. I. ter.-re. II. re.-re. III. re.-re.
1598?-1604	El casamiento en la muerte	46	19	15		9	3	6		1			
1599-1602?	Los tres diamantes	55	20	7		2	4	10		2			
1599-1603	La ocasión perdida (not accessible to me)												
1599-1603	Los embustes de Ce- lauro	49	24	8		5		8		2	3		I. q.-re. II. suelt.-q. III. lira-re.
1599-1603	Lucinda perseguida (not accessible to me)												
1599-1603?	Los esclavos libres	38	36	7		9	10			1/2			I. q.-suelt. II. q.-rom. III. red.-suelt.
1601?-03	El caballero de Illescas	77		11		8	2			1/2		(20) song	I. re.-oct. II. re.-son. III. oct.-rom.
1604?-05?	El secretario de sí mismo (not ac- cessible to me)												
1604?-09?	El ruiñeñor de Se- villa. ⁴¹	70	6	11		2	10			1		(13) song	I. re.-re. II. re.-re. III. q.-rom.
1605?-08?	El hombre de bien	53	24	8		3	3	9		1			I. re.-re.

1605?-08?	El hombre de bien	53	24	8	3	3	9	1	I. re-re. II. q-re. III. re-rom.
1606?-12?	El castigo del discreto	49	31	11	1	2	6	1/2	I. re-q. II. re-rom. III. re-rom.
1610	La hermosa Ester	26	20	22	12	8	1	4	I. rom-oct. II. suelt-rom. III. re-rom.
1613?	La burgalesa de Lerma	30	21	35	3	4	5	1	I. re-re. II. q-rom. III. re-rom.
1613?-17	El animal de Hungría	40	17	21	7	1	5	6 1/2	I. silva-rom. II. q-rom. III. re-rom.
1615?-18	Los ramilletes de Madrid	36	9	33	5	8	3	2	I. re-rom. II. ter-re. III. re-rom.
1615?-19	Al pasar del arroyo	52	6	20	3	1	6	2 1/2	I. q-rom. II. re-rom. III. dec-rom.
1625?-32	La mayor desgracia de Carlos V	23	61	2	7	1	2	1 1/2	I. re-rom. II. re-rom. III. re-rom.
1630?-35	No son todos ruiseñores	39	38	12	8	2	1	1/2	I. re-rom. II. re-rom. III. dec-rom.

³⁹ In this Schedule I have followed Professor Buchanan's arrangement, so as to facilitate comparison of this table with his. The only change I have made has been the addition of a separate column for *liras*. Numbers indicate percentage of verse forms.

⁴⁰ Numbers in parentheses mean lines of verse, not percentage.

⁴¹ J. F. Montesinos dates this play 1604-1609, believing it to be nearer 1604. *Cf. Rev. fil. esp.*, IX, 35 f.

Girard College, Philadelphia.

WILLIAM L. FICHTER.

NOTES ON PERFORMANCES OF FRENCH MYSTERY PLAYS

Paris, 1539.—The anonymous *Cronique du Roy François Premier* contains the following passage (p. 268 of the edition of Georges Guiffrey, 1860):

"Le dimenche XVIIIe jour de may, ondict an (i. e. 1539) fut faiet une monstre à Paris du mistère et jeu de la passion, qui fut chouse fort triumpante et magnifique, car tous les personnaiges estoient habilleez de velours, drap d'or, satin et d'aultres de soye de diverses couleurs, et n'y avoit personnaige qui ne fust habillé de différant habit, qui estoit chouse admirable et délectable à veoir.

Et le lundy, landemain de la Pentecouste, XXVIe jour dudict mois ondict an, on commensa à jouer ledict jeu et misteire au logis de Flandres, qui est ung fort grant logis, onquel y avoit plusieurs eschaffaulx fort sumptueulx et tenduz de riches tapisseries pour recepvoir les princes qui y assistèrent, et mesmes le Roy et Messeigneurs le Daulphin et duc d'Orléans, ses enfans, et aultres princes et gentilzhommes en grand nombre; et commencèrent ce dict jour à jouer le mistère d'Abraham et sacrifice de Isaac son seul filz et unique."

This passage was not known in its entirety to Petit de Julleville when he wrote his work on the French mystery plays and has never been adequately considered in its relation to the religious drama. The "mistère et jeu de la passion" of the *Cronique* was in all probability Jean Michel's *Passion*, this being the one passion play that seems to have been popular in Paris at this time. From 1486 to 1542 some eleven or twelve printed editions of it appeared, probably all in Paris, and the title pages of certain of these mention performances in Paris in 1490 and 1507. Petit de Julleville states (II, 137) that the edition of 1539 mentions a recent representation of the play at Paris (which would naturally be the one in the *Cronique*), but the abridged title page of this edition in Brunet's *Manuel* (III, 1975) does not include such mention.

The most interesting fact which the *Cronique* seems clearly to show is that the "mistère," which probably required five or six days for its performance, was preceded by an introductory performance of the *Sacrifice d'Abraham* as an Old Testament antitype or prefiguration of Christ's sacrificial passion.¹ The *Passion* of Jean

¹This play of *Abraham*, as the brothers Parfait have pointed out, is simply section VII of the well-known *Mystère du Vieux Testament*, touched up a little.

Michel, in the form in which it was always printed and doubtless generally played, had no Old Testament scenes but began with the nativity of the Virgin and the nativity of Christ. The more common French practice, however, was to have, introductory to the passion, that is, to the redemption of sin, certain scenes relating to the origin of sin. The usual tradition included the Creation, the Fall of the Angels, the Fall of Man, the Slaying of Abel, Noah's Ark, the Debate of the Four Virtues (as to whether Man should be saved) and the Prophets of Christ. These scenes, in so far as they are from the Old Testament, were not, however, used as antitypes or prefigurations of New Testament events. Prefigurations are rare in the French religious drama, much rarer than in Germany, and this makes this Paris case of 1539 especially noteworthy. I know of no other similar case in France,² unless it be at Lyons, where this Parisian example seems to have been promptly imitated. In the permanent theater of Jean Neyron at Lyons, which lasted but three years, 1538 to 1541, performances of the Old and New Testaments were given.³ Now, of the three printed editions of the *Sacrifice d'Abraham*, one mentions no performance, one mentions the performance at Paris in 1539, and the third says it was played "à Paris et depuis à Lyon." While this may mean simply its performance at Lyons in its regular position in the Old Testament cycle, it seems more probable from being thus linked with the Paris performance that it was used at Lyons also as a prefigurative introduction to the passion.

There are close German parallels to this use of the *Abraham*. At Frankfurt in 1498 a passion play lasting five days was given. The first of these days was devoted entirely to introductory scenes, beginning with Abraham's sacrifice, but including also the story of Susanna, the parable of the rich man and Lazarus, and of the

² In the *mystères mimés* at Lille and Béthune, and doubtless elsewhere, scenes of the New Testament were at times accompanied by Old Testament prefigurations, usually two to each, after the manner of the *biblia pauperum*. At St. Omer, in 1443, payments were made for a "mystère du viel Testament et rapporté au nouvel." (Justin de Pas, *Mystères et Jeux Scéniques à Saint-Omer*, 1913, p. 34). A careful search would probably reveal a few other French cases; for Germany see Toni Weber, *Die Praefigurationen im geistlichen Drama Deutschlands*, 1919 (Marburg Diss.)

³ Petit de Julleville, II, 135.

prodigal son, all four of these being prefigurative of moments in the following passion.⁴ At Löbau, on Holy Cross day, 1521, there was a procession or *mystère mimé* with nineteen "figures" showing in sequence the life of Christ, preceded by two "figures" from the Old Testament, Adam and Eve and Abraham's Sacrifice.⁵ At Uerdingen, in the seventeenth century, a brief dialog between Abraham and Isaac preceded the passion on Good Friday.⁶ At Villingen, in the early eighteenth century, a passion play was given every two years, preceded by one Old Testament prefiguration, a different one each time.⁷

The only part of the passage from the *Cronique* that Petit de Julleville used was the first paragraph and this only as inaccurately cited by Sorel⁸ with the omission of the "à Paris." He knew the whole passage later, in time for a brief reference to it in his appendix (II, 645), but failed to point out or correct the misstatements in the body of his work that resulted from his not knowing it earlier. His half page concerning the passion play at Compiègne in 1539 (II, 136) must be entirely deleted. His statement (II, 137) that it is generally believed that the *confrères* did not come to the Hôtel de Flandres until 1540 and that the editions of the *Sacrifice d'Abraham* and of Jean Michel's *Passion*, both bearing the date of 1539 with mention of performances in the Hôtel de Flandres, are probably ante-dated needs revision or deletion, especially as it conflicts with an earlier true statement of his own about the *Abraham* (I, 423). Although, as is well-known, the *confrères* gave the *Mystère du Vieux Testament* in 1542, Petit de Julleville's remark (II, 137) connecting the *Abraham* of 1539 with this latter undertaking, as a sort of preliminary "try-out"—"cette représentation fut un essai dont le succès les encouragea"—is doubtless unwarranted and ignores the prefigurative relation of the *Abraham* to the *Passion*.

⁴ Froning, *Drama des Mittelalters*, p. 542.

⁵ Karl Preusker, *Blicke in die vaterländische Vorzeit* (1841), p. 96-100.

⁶ A. Rein, *Vier geistliche Spiele des 17. Jahrhunderts für Charfreitag und Fronleichnamfest*, p. 17-22.

⁷ *Freiburger Diözesan-Archiv*, 1916, p. 185.

⁸ *Notice sur les mystères représentés à Compiègne au moyen âge*, in the *Bulletin de la Société historique de Compiègne*, II, 43. Cf. Petit de Julleville, II, 136.

Germain Bapst knew this passage, for he says in connection with the Hôtel de Flandres: "A prendre à la lettre la *Chronique de François 1^{er}*, on pourrait supposer que l'on construisait à l'extrémité de la salle opposée à la scène une estrade spacieuse, élevée, d'où l'on dominait le spectacle, pour y placer le souverain et les princes."⁹ This supposition, somewhat hesitatingly made, is doubtless correct, for there was the same general arrangement in the Hôtel d'Orléans at St. Marcel, a near suburb (now a part) of Paris, when the *Mystère de St. Christophe* was given there in 1540: ". . . item, fault faire ung autre escharfault (*i. e.*, other than the stage scaffold) de l'autre costé, vis-à-vis dudict escharfault cy dessus, qui sera de quatorze toises de long sur six piedz dedans oeuvre, cloz et couvert, reste devant, pour la veue dud. jeu, garny d'une montée en lymon, comme dessus, ledict escharfault deuement soustenu et garny d'aiz, tellement qu'il n'en puisse venir fault . . ." ¹⁰

Paris, 1541.—There has been preserved a diary written by some one in the entourage of Duke William of Cleves and telling of the Duke's journey to France in 1541 to wed Joan of Navarre, niece of Francis I. After the wedding and the sumptuous festivities that followed (which are described also in detail in the *Cronique* that we have been considering), the Duke left his child-wife with her mother and started upon his return journey, going by way of Paris. At this point occurs the following passage:

Op Guidesdach ipso Petri et Pauli, XXIX. Junii VII mylen vortan gereden to Parisz. Uitwendich der Stadt . . . quaemen syner g. vnder oogen

⁹ *Essai sur l'histoire du théâtre*, p. 69.

¹⁰ E. Coyecque, *Recueil d'actes notariés relatifs à l'histoire de Paris et de ses environs au XVI^e siècle*, (in *Histoire générale de Paris*), p. 294. Cohen (*Histoire de la mise en scène*, p. 83, 87, and 136) was the first to call attention to the interesting contracts preliminary to this play. He cites the details about the music and about the stage and "paradis," but does not give the passage here cited, nor the following one:

" . . . (the work to be done in fifteen days) avecques la barriere de boys pour servir au gardefol à l'entrée dud. jeu, et la maçonnerie de l'enfer, de plastre et peine seullement, et lesd. Veau et consors seront tenuz fournir de pierre et moison, tant qu'il en fauldra; et si fournira ledict Corivault de deux pieces de boys d'ung demy pied en carrure et de troys toises de long, pour faire ung gibet garny d'une piece à travers des deux liens; et led. jeu fyny, reprandra ledict Corivault tout son boys et ayz . . ."

die oeuerste von der Stadt Parisz . . . und hebben syne g. vergeleidet an eyns Edelmans husz, dair syn g. to gaste geladen was.

Achter desern huyse was ein groet schoen Theatrum mit eynen hoegen pauillion van lynendoick bedeckt, vnd was dat Theatrum gemaicht int Ronde off die Romische alde maniere, dat alle menschen sitten mochten, die eyn hoeger dan di ander, tot XX gesessen toe vnd dair bauen noch III solders int ronde, alle mit verscheiden kaemeren vnd galeryen lustlich gemaecht. In dessem Theatro hatt men des naemiddachs ein schon spill gehalten van etlichen historien, vitten geschefften der Apostolen, de Petro, Symone Mago et Herode mit seer frembden und lustigen solemniteten und triumph kostlich zugerüst, wilchs myn gn. her mit angesehen, dair dan eine groisze unzalbar hauff van luiden gewest vnd mit zugesehen.

Und des auentz, als solchs geschiet, hauen die Meisters van den Spill mynen gn. hern eyne collation oder Bancket zugerust, vnd is syn g. alsdan gereden in des Ammirals husz by S. Anthonisz straisse, aldair syn f. g. logiert gewest.¹¹

We have here a few interesting facts which, so far as I know, have never been brought to the attention of students of the early religious drama. It is well known that the *confrères de la Passion* were giving the *Actes des Apôtres* in Paris in 1541 on their indoor stage in the Hôtel de Flandres. Here, however, is trustworthy evidence of an afternoon's performance, given presumably also by the *confrères*, in an outdoor theater of a type usual in the provinces but not before known to have been used in Paris, "a beautiful, large, theater, covered with a high pavilion of linen cloth, the theatre made round in the old Roman manner, so that all the people could sit, one higher than the other, up to twenty rows of seats, and above all around, three more tiers, all pleasantly made with different chambers and galleries." The performance was evidently a special one in honor of the Duke, who was entertained lavishly throughout his stay in France, and it is reasonable to assume that the theater was a temporary one built for this special purpose. Whether it was used more than this once it is impossible to say. A somewhat similar case was in 1542 when the *confrères* who were then playing the *Vieux Testament* were ordered to give a special performance of this upon the occasion of a visit of the Duke of Vendome, but they gave it apparently upon their usual indoor stage.¹² The play of

¹¹ *Zeitschrift des Bergischen Geschichtsvereins*, I, 34; the diary has also been published in Lacomblet's *Archiv für die Geschichte des Niederrheins*, v, 129 f.

¹² Petit de Julleville, II, 141.

1541 for the Duke of Cleves was plainly a part of the long *Actes des Apôtres*. If it was a regular section of this play, as preserved in printed form, it must have been from Book IV, for this is the only place where the three characters mentioned, Peter, Simon Magus, and Herod Agrippa, all appear within the possible limits of an afternoon's performance. Even thus Simon Magus would not have an important or effective role. We know, however, that plays were often cut, and it is possible, especially for this unique occasion, that some special arrangement or abridgement was given.

Béthune, 1562.—At Béthune it was customary to stage the scenes of a *mystère mimé* on stationary *hourds* or platforms situated along the line of the Corpus Christi procession. Of the one in 1562 Petit de Julleville says (II, 214): "En 1562 il y eut 32 *hourds* . . . mais ce fut par des mannequins et non par personnages, que les diverses corporations représentèrent les scènes de la Passion. Cette sorte d'exhibition n'appartient plus du tout au drame." This statement is entirely erroneous; the scenes were given "par personnages." The error seems to be due to a misunderstanding of the statement of De la Fons-Mélicocq: "En 1562, c'était par 'des figures' que, sur les XXXII *hourds* érigés par les corps de métiers, on rappelait aux pieux catholiques toutes les phases des humiliations et des souffrances du Sauveur," although Didron had given the explanation: "Il faut entendre, par toutes ces *figures*, la représentation des faits de l'Ancien Testament, qui sont regardés comme des *images* du Nouveau."¹³ Definite evidence that the scenes were given by persons is found in the fact that the three actors representing Christ and the good and bad thieves, having exhausting roles, were given each "une canne de vin," a form of compensation that is frequently mentioned in the Béthune records. Thus the scenes in 1562 differed from those in 1549 (Petit de Julleville, II, 212) by representing not the New Testament scenes alone, but these scenes, accompanied each by two "figures," or prefigurations, from the Old Testament as in the *Biblia Pauperum*.

NEIL C. BROOKS.

University of Illinois.

¹³ See Mélicocq in the *Documents inédits* to which Petit de Julleville refers and also in *Annales Archéologiques*, VIII, 272; Didron in *Annales Arch.*, X, 249, also VIII, 274 (note 5).

MELÉNDEZ VALDÉS' VANIDAD DE LAS QUEJAS DEL
HOMBRE CONTRA SU HACEDOR AND THE
PENSÉES OF PASCAL

One of the most striking examples of the predominance of French ideas in Spanish literature of the eighteenth century, a condition due to the commanding place in European affairs then occupied by France, as well as to the political ties that bound Spain to her northern neighbor, is the influence of Pascal's *Pensées* on Meléndez Valdés' religious poem, *Vanidad de las Quejas del Hombre contra su Hacedor*.

The peculiar temperament of the Spanish poet explains the extent of his obligation. Of Juan Meléndez Valdés (1754-1817) Fitzmaurice-Kelly says: "Meléndez was a weather-cock at the mercy of every breeze. A writer of erotic verse, he thought of taking orders; a pastoral poet, he turned to philosophy by Jove-Llanos' advice; unfortunate in his marriage, discontented with his professorship at Salamanca, he dabbled in politics. . . . He typifies the fluctuations of his time. . . . 'Obra soy tuya,' he writes to Jove-Llanos. He was ever the handiwork of the last comer: a shadow of insincerity, of pose, is over all his works."¹

It is easy to imagine such a man, fired by the reading of Pascal's masterpiece, rushing to his study, and there pouring out his heart in temporarily sincere, though borrowed, praise to the Creator.

The purpose of the Spanish poem is the same as that of the *Pensées*, to give man a just estimate of his position in the universe, to show him both his insignificance and his greatness, and to lead him thereby to an attitude of resignation and piety.

Pascal places man midway between nothingness and infinity. "Car, enfin, qu'est-ce que l'homme dans la nature?" he asks.² And the answer comes:

Un néant à l'égard de l'infini, un tout à l'égard du néant, un milieu entre rien et tout. Infiniment éloigné de comprendre les extrêmes, la fin des choses et leurs principes sont pour lui invinci-

¹ Fitzmaurice-Kelly, *A History of Spanish Literature* (New York and London, 1912), p. 358, 359.

² Pascal, *Œuvres*, ed. Brunschvicg, XII, 72-79 (Section II of the *Pensées*).

blement cachés dans un secret impénétrable, également incapable de voir le néant d'où il est tiré, et l'infini où il est englouti.

MeléndeZ says:

¿Del infinito en medio y de la nada
Qué es el hombre ignorante?

Man's position is, however, merely one expression of a universal system; all things share with him his evolution toward the infinite.

MeléndeZ Valdés writes:

Las cosas todas en la nada nacen,
Y en lo infinito paran: quien las cría
Contará solo los guarismos que hacen.

Pascal had expressed the same thought thus:

Toutes choses sont sorties du néant et portées jusqu'à l'infini. Qui suivra ces étonnantes démarches? L'auteur de ces merveilles les comprend. Tout autre ne le peut faire.

Both authors urge man to lift his eyes to the infinite spaces of the heavens, and to consider the sun, compared with which our earth is only a tiny point.

In the *Pensées* we find:

Qu'il (l'homme) éloigne sa vue des objets bas qui l'environnent. Qu'il regarde cette éclatante lumière, mise comme une lampe éternelle pour éclairer l'univers. Que la terre lui paraisse comme un point, au prix du vaste tour que cet astre décrit et qu'il s'étonne de ce que ce vaste tour lui-même n'est qu'une pointe très délicate à l'égard de celui que les astres qui roulent dans le firmament embrassent. . . . Que l'homme, étant revenu à soi, considère ce qu'il est au prix de ce qui est, qu'il se regarde comme égaré dans ce canton détourné de la nature; et que de ce petit cachot où il se trouve logé, j'entends l'univers, il apprenne à estimer la terre, les royaumes, les villes et soi-même son juste prix.

MeléndeZ says on this subject:

¡Hijo del polvo, si elevarla osas,
Alza la vista al cielo, y ve la esfera
De estrellas tachonada,
Todas a par hermosas!
¿Es solo para tí tanta lumbrera?
Acaso cada cual será empleada
En bañar con dorada
Llama como acá el sol, otro gran suelo;

Y los que el globo de Saturno moran,
 Tan lejos como tú miran el cielo,
 Y que tú habitas este punto ignoran.

Man having sufficiently convinced himself of his insignificance compared with the infinitely great, is now urged to turn his attention to the infinitely little.

Pascal develops the thought thus:

Qu'est-ce qu'un homme dans l'infini? Mais pour lui présenter un autre prodige aussi étonnant, qu'il recherche dans ce qu'il connaît les choses les plus délicates. Qu'un ciron lui offre dans la petitesse de son corps des parties incomparablement plus petites, des jambes avec des jointures, des veines dans ses jambes, du sang dans ses veines, des humeurs dans ce sang, des gouttes dans ses humeurs, des vapeurs dans ces gouttes; que, divisant encore ces dernières choses, il épuise ses forces en ces conceptions, et que le dernier objet où il peut arriver soit maintenant celui de notre discours; il pensera peut-être que c'est là l'extrême petitesse de la nature. Je veux lui faire voir là-dedans un abîme nouveau. Je lui veux peindre non seulement l'univers visible, mais l'immensité qu'on peut concevoir de la nature, dans l'enceinte de ce raccourci d'atome. Qu'il y voie une infinité d'univers, dont chacun a son firmament, ses planètes, sa terre, en la même proportion que le monde visible; dans cette terre, des animaux, et enfin des cirons, dans lesquels il retrouvera ce que les premiers ont donné; et trouvant encore dans les autres la même chose sans fin et sans repos, qu'il se perde dans ces merveilles, . . .

Meléndez follows his French original very closely:

Los ojos vuelve hacia la baja tierra,
 Y a sus vivientes llega a tu despecho:
 El más imperceptible
 Mil otros en sí encierra.
 Del mosquito sutil ;Qué inmenso trecho
 Al que apenas la lente hace visible!
 ¿Y acaso no es posible
 Descender aun de aquel? pues él contiene
 Dentro en sí otros, que a vivir dispone:
 Cada cual movimiento y partes tiene,
 Y cada parte de otras se compone.

Those parts of the Spanish poem which are not taken from the French consist of pious moralizing and paraphrases of the book of Job.

GILBERT M. FESS.

University of Pennsylvania.

A NEW DATE FOR GEORGE WILKINS'S *THREE MISERIES OF BARBARY*

George Wilkins has long interested scholars because of his share in *Pericles*¹ and of his possible collaboration in other plays of Shakespeare. Recently Mr. Wallace discovered evidence² showing that Wilkins was probably a personal acquaintance of Shakespeare; and Professor Adams has suggested³ that he may be responsible for *The Hystorie of Hamblet*. A still further link between Wilkins and Shakespeare can be established by the redating of the *Three Miseries of Barbary*,⁴ as proposed in this paper, for this redating carries an answer to a bibliographical question raised by the bad Shakespeare quartos of 1619.⁵

Scholars have heretofore conjectured that the *Three Miseries* was published in 1603 or 1604.⁶ Although these dates are presumably based upon internal evidence, no one, so far as I know, has revealed the nature of that evidence. A careful examination of the text and a study of the bibliographical features involved show that the date cannot be earlier than 1606, and that it is in all probability 1607.

I. *The Internal Evidence.* The references to historical events may be divided, according to subject, into four groups: the death of the king of Morocco; civil wars in Barbary; civil wars in

¹ The latest and most thorough study of this problem is that of Mr. H. Dugdale Sykes, in *Sidelights on Shakespeare* (1919).

² In the Mountjoy Documents, reprinted in *Nebraska University Studies*, x (1910), 261.

³ *A Life of William Shakespeare* (1923), 400 n.

⁴ Three/ Miseries of Barbary: / Plague. / Famine. / Ciuill warre. / With a relation of the death of Maha- / met the late Emperour: and a briefe / report of the now present Wars / betweene the three Brothers. / [Device: the Half Eagle and Key] / Printed by W. I. for Henry Gosson, and are to be sold / in Pater noster rowe at the signe of the Sunne. / 4to, black letter, 15 leaves. British Museum 1046. d. 24.

The preface is signed "Geo. Wilkins."

⁵ See A. W. Pollard, *Shakespeare Folios and Quartos* (1909).

⁶ Hazlitt (*Hand-Book*, 656), 1603; Collier, *Bibliographical Account of Early English Literature*, iv, 262, 1602-3; Sir Sidney Lee (*Dictionary of National Biography*, art. George Wilkins), 1604; H. D. Sykes (*Sidelights on Shakespeare*, 78 and 144), 1603.

France and the Low Countries; and freedom from plague, famine, and civil war in England.

The death of the king of Morocco is referred to in the following passages:

Titlepage: Three Miseries of Barbary: Plague. Famine. Ciuill warre.
With a relation of the death of Mahamet the *late*⁷ Emperour. . . .
D 1 recto: The Pestilence . . . did at the last set upon the Emperour Mahamet himselfe, and with her venomous breath kild him.

This Mahamet, or, as he was commonly called, El-Mansour, died of the plague August 20, 1603.⁸ But there is no reason to assume that the word *late* in the passage quoted from the title-page could not be properly employed at a date later than 1603, or even 1604. Dekker, referring in 1606 to the plague of 1602-3 and to the death of Queen Elizabeth (March 24, 1603), uses the same word: "What miseries haue of *late* ouertaken thee?"⁹

Civil Wars in Barbary. The passages which refer to the civil strife in Barbary are:

Titlepage: With a relation of the death of Mahamet the late Emperour: and a briefe report of the *now present* Wars betweene the three Brothers.
B 3 recto: Betweene these three [brothers, sons of the king of Morocco] were these *late* ciuell warres in Barbary.
D 2 verso: The three sonnes of so great an Emperour, shine *now* like three Meteors in the firmament, all in steele, their Courts *now* are Campes, and none are Courtiers but Souldiers. Three Brothers beeing all three kings, are up in Armes, only to make of three but one, miseries upon miserie.
D 3 recto: This fire of Discention hath *now* taken holde of Barbarie. . . .

In the second quotation above Wilkins was doubtless using the word *late* in the sense in which Dekker used it in his *Seven Deadly Sins*; by the word *now* in the other quotations he refers to a civil strife which began, it is true, in 1603, but which continued until at least 1610.¹⁰

⁷ Here and in subsequent quotations italics mine.

⁸ C. Huart, *Histoire des Arabes* (Paris, 1913), II, 218: "El-Mançoûr fut emporté l'année suivante par la peste qui régnaît dans le Maghreb, le mercredi 11 rêbî 'I 1012 (20 août 1603)."

⁹ *The Seuen deadly Sinnes of London*, Grosart, II, 11.

¹⁰ Edward Grimston, in Richard Knolles's *The Generall Historie of the Turkes* (5th ed., '638), 1301, recording the events of the year 1610, says: "There was a warre fallen out in Barbary betwixt Muley Xequy, King

Civil Wars in France and the Low Countries.

D 2 verso: O noble France, if I should bid thee onely to tell the horror, the terrors, the unbounded mischief and calamity that come marching in with intestine [*sic*] Broyles, thou needest to say nothing, but to open thy bosome, and shew those deepe scars which thine owne sons haue set there. There are tears *yet* in thine eyes, for those sad funeralls which the Ciuill sworde prepared. The Low-Countries haue beene in labour a long time, and are *not yet* deliuered of that Monster.

As late as 1609, in "A Prayer in time of ciuill warre,"¹¹ Dekker refers to the same circumstances:

"We haue beene (O Lord) a long time lookers on vpon our neighbour-contreyes, and haue seene their cities turned to cinders, yet haue not beene scorched with the flames. *France doeth yet mourne in the ashes of those fires, and Germany*¹² *is evē now stifled with the smoaks.*"

Freedom from plague, famine, and civil war in England. Wilkins makes much of the point that England, even though more sinful than Barbary, is free from the punishments that are being suffered by the inhabitants of Barbary.

The Epistle: The chiefe and farthest point that my intention seeks to arriue at in this, is to describe the horreur and vn-heard-of misery that hath falne vpon that Kingdome by a Plague: to the intent that by comparing our sins with theirs (being altogether as greet if not greater) and the *hand of mercy which Heauen hath stretcht forth ouer our Nation, aboue theirs*, we may be allured to looke into our soules betimes, *least the like Viols of Wrath bee poured downe vppon vs.*

Obviously Wilkins is contrasting the deplorable plight of Barbary with the happy state of England; but if he were referring merely to the plague, he could not make such a contrast, because the plague in Barbary occurred in the same year as that in England, 1603. The "like Viols of Wrath," then, are the punishments which *followed* the plague of 1603,—famine and civil war, the latter of which, as I have said, lasted in Barbary as late as 1610, and did not exist in England.

of Fez, and Muley Sidan his younger brother. . . ." These are two of the three brothers referred to by Wilkins in his pamphlet.

¹¹ *Four Birdes of Noahs Arke*, Grosart, v, 57. For a similar reference in 1606 see Dekker's *Seven Deadly Sins*, Grosart, II, 9-10.

¹² "With Dekker, 'Germany' often means the Netherlands."—M. L. Hunt, *Thomas Dekker*, 24.

This interpretation of the foregoing passage is substantiated by the following:

D 4 recto: Our late calamities inflicted [*sic.*] upon us for our sinnes are *fresh in memory*, the eyes of many people are *yet* wet with mourning at burials, the rod is *stil* held ouer us, the stripes of it are euen *nowe* to be seene sticking in our flesh. Yet you see howe the Great Father of Nations, keepes us under his wing, he is loth to chide, more loath to strike us, let us not therefore, like foolish haire-braind children, prouoke him too often, and too much to anger, *least he take up his triple Mace of hote vengeance, and with it bruze our people, as hee hath already stretcht out his Arme to smite those of Barbarie.*

The "triple Mace of hote vengeance" is, of course, the combination of plague, famine, and civil war, only the first of which England had had to endure.

It might be objected that the words *late*, *still*, *yet*, *now* indicate that the pamphlet was written in the year in which the plague occurred, or at latest in the year following; and the phrase *fresh in memory* might serve to make this objection convincing. I have already referred to Dekker's use of the word *late* three years after the occurrence of the events to which he was referring; in the same year, 1606, referring to the plague of 1602-3, Dekker¹³ uses precisely the same phrase that Wilkins here employs:

Heere could I make thee weepe thy selfe away into waters by calling back those sad and dismall houres, wherein thou consumedst almost to nothing with shrieks and lamentations, in that Wonderfull yeere, when these miserable calamities entred in at thy Gates, slaying 30000. and more as thou heldst them in thine armes; but they are *fresh in thy memory*. . . .

If there were no other evidence than that already examined, we should need nothing further to convince us that the pamphlet might have been written at least three or four years after 1603. But there is one more bit of evidence in the *Epistle of the Three Miseries* which clinches the matter: Wilkins informs the reader that he has brought together some of "the best and maine occurents which haue *now lately* (and *not many yeares past*) hapned in Barbary," emphasizing, by marks of parenthesis, his phrase "not many yeares past."

II. *The External Evidence.* From the evidence thus far examined, it is safe to assume that the *Three Miseries of Barbary*

¹³ *The Seuen deadly Sinnes of London*, Grosart, II, 12.

was not published in 1603 or 1604, and that it was probably published at least three or four years later. There is external evidence which not only substantiates this conclusion, but makes practically certain the year 1607 as the date of publication.

The Period of Wilkins's Literary Activity. The other works for which Wilkins is known to have been in whole or in part responsible were all published in the years 1607 and 1608. These works, with dates of publication, are: *The Miseries of Enforced Marriage*, 1607; *The Travels of the Three English Brothers*,¹⁴ 1607; *Jests To Make You Merie*,¹⁵ 1607; the novel *Pericles*, 1608. There is no record that Wilkins wrote as early as 1603; and since three of the four works upon which his name appears were published in 1607, there is at least a presumption that the *Three Miseries* may have been published in the same year.

The Printer. We come now to the most important part of the evidence. Upon the titlepage of the *Three Miseries of Barbary* appears the device of the Half Eagle and Key, the arms of the city of Geneva.¹⁶ The imprint tells us that the printer was "W. I." Hazlitt¹⁷ and Sir Sidney Lee¹⁸ conjecture that these initials stand for William Jones, but there is no evidence that Jones ever used the Half Eagle and Key device. That William Jaggard owned the device is, however, well known. According to Mr. Pollard,¹⁹ Jaggard seems to have used the device fairly often after 1610; he used it notably in 1619, upon the titlepage of his quarto of *A Midsummer Night's Dream*.

Although the device apparently passed from James Roberts to Jaggard in 1606, when Jaggard bought Roberts's printing business in the Barbican, neither Mr. Pollard nor Mr. McKerrow has discovered any evidence that Jaggard used the block²⁰ before 1617,

¹⁴ The dedication is signed by John Day, William Rowley, and George Wilkins. Reprinted by A. H. Bullen in *The Works of John Day* (1881).

¹⁵ By "T. D. and George Wilkins." Reprinted in Grosart's *The Non-Dramatic Works of Thomas Dekker*, II.

¹⁶ For the history of this device see A. W. Pollard, *Shakespeare Folios and Quartos* (1909), 105; and R. B. McKerrow, *Printers' and Publishers' Devices* (1913), 49.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, 656.

¹⁸ Introduction to Facsimile of *Pericles* (1905), 21.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, 106.

²⁰ In 1609 Jaggard used the design of the Half Eagle and Key device as part of the ornamental border to Heywood's *Troia Britannica*.

when the device appeared at the end of *A godly Sermon preached in 1388*.

There is, however, evidence that Jaggard used the block before 1617—on the titlepage of George Wilkins's *The Miseries of Enforced Marriage*,²¹ published in 1607. Although the imprint gives neither the name nor the initials of the printer, it is certain that the play was printed by Jaggard: the impression made by the device shows the same flaws and irregularities which appear in the impression of this device upon the titlepage of Jaggard's quarto of *A Midsummer Night's Dream*. But this is not all. The ornamental headpiece²² to the titlepage of *The Miseries* is the same as that used by Jaggard on five of the bad quartos of 1619.²³ The tailpiece of *The Miseries* is the headpiece to the titlepage of Jaggard's quarto of *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, and the headpiece to the first page of text of his quarto of *Henry Fifth*. And there is still another link between *The Miseries of Enforced Marriage* and Jaggard's known work: the ornamental headpiece to the first page of text corresponds to the headpiece of the titlepage of Jaggard's quarto of *Henry Fifth*.

Thus it is certain that Jaggard printed *The Miseries of Enforced Marriage* in 1607, using the device of the Half Eagle and Key. I shall now show that he printed also the *Three Miseries of Barbary*.

The titlepage of this pamphlet has the same device, the Half Eagle and Key, with the same irregularities, that Jaggard used upon the titlepages of *The Miseries of Enforced Marriage*, *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, and *The Plain Man's Pathway*. The tailpiece of the *Three Miseries* is the tailpiece of *Henry Fifth*. The *Finis* of the *Three Miseries* is the *Finis* of Jaggard's quartos of *King Lear* and *The Whole Contention*, Part I. The ornamental headpiece to the dedication of the *Three Miseries* is the headpiece to the titlepage of *Henry Fifth*, and to the first page of text of *The Miseries of Enforced Marriage*. And finally, types from the same three fonts are used in the *Three Miseries of Barbary* and

²¹ See Mr. John S. Farmer's reproduction of this text in *The Tudor Facsimile Texts*.

²² The Royal Arms: *Honi soit qui mal y pense*.

²³ *King Lear*, *Pericles*, *Henry Fifth*, *The Merchant of Venice*, *The Whole Contention*, Part II. See the *Shakspeare Quarto Facsimiles*, by W. Griggs and C. Praetorius.

The Miseries of Enforced Marriage to make up titlepages which bear a striking resemblance to each other.

Unquestionably, then, the "W. I." of the *Three Miseries* imprint stands for William Jaggard.

I have thus shown (1) that Jaggard used the Half Eagle and Key device in 1607, and (2) that he printed the *Three Miseries of Barbary*. Since James Roberts did not sell his printing business to Jaggard until 1606, Jaggard could not have used the Half Eagle and Key device before that year; therefore he could not have printed the *Three Miseries of Barbary* before 1606. And since he used the device on Wilkins's *The Miseries of Enforced Marriage* in 1607, it is probable that he used it on Wilkins's *Three Miseries of Barbary* in the same year. This date seems the more likely when we consider that, with one exception (the novel *Pericles*), all of Wilkins's other known works were published in 1607.

GUY SHEPARD GREENE.

Cornell University.

REVIEWS

Nature's Simple Plan: a Phase of Radical Thought in the Mid-Eighteenth Century. By CHAUNCEY BREWSTER TINKER. Princeton: Princeton University Press. London: Humphrey Milford, Oxford University Press. 1922. Pp. vi, 117.

The four lectures which make up this little book were originally delivered at Princeton University on the Louis Clark Vanuxem Foundation. They deal with various aspects of the "theory of simplicity—the way of Nature—in the England of 1770": the attack upon luxury, with its corollary that "civilisation had somehow or other failed of its goal"; the influence of the explorations of the 'sixties and 'seventies in arousing interest in the "primitive" peoples of the South Seas; the furor caused by the coming to London of Omai, the South Sea Islander, and of Captain Cartwright's Esquimaux; the speculations of Lord Monboddo; the enthusiasm of liberals for Corsica, and the disillusionment which followed the conquest of that island by the French; the interest in "ancient bards" and in "peasant poets."

Like Professor Tinker's other writings on the eighteenth century, these lectures have the merit of being well written and genuinely entertaining. They can be recommended wholeheartedly to the general reader, for whom, indeed, they would seem to have been written, and whom they cannot fail to infect with some of their author's enthusiasm for his favorite period. Nor will they be entirely thrown away on the professional scholar, who, unless his documentation is more exhaustive than that of most of us, will be grateful for the many references to obscure texts—on the South Seas, on Corsica, on the preparation for Burns—which Professor Tinker's wide reading has enabled him to supply.

For all its freshness and charm, however, the book is somewhat disappointing. It would be unfair, of course, to lay too much stress upon the inadequacy of the treatment of many topics, upon the occasional lack of precision or accuracy in references and dates, or upon the somewhat haphazard character of the illustrative details, the result rather of chance reading or of Professor Tinker's earlier studies of Boswell and Johnson than of anything like a methodical exploration of the available sources; for the book is not intended as a scholarly monograph, but merely as a series of suggestive essays on a movement of thought that has a very definite significance for the present day. The really serious fault of the volume is a fault of perspective: Professor Tinker greatly exaggerates the novelty and importance of many of the phenomena with which he deals. As this is a defect which his book has in common with many more pretentious works on the later eighteenth century, there can be no harm in dwelling briefly upon some of its manifestations.

The thesis developed in the first and third lectures ("The State of Nature" and "Ancient Bard and Gentle Savage") is perhaps best stated in the words of Boswell's *Hypochondriack* which serve as a motto to the first lecture: "The difference between the savage and civilised state of man has been much considered of late years, since so many discoveries of distant regions and new nations have been made under his present majesty's patronage, and since an eloquent writer upon the continent and even a learned judge who is an author in our own island have thought fit to maintain the superiority of the former." Taking his cue from this passage, Professor Tinker insists, justly enough, upon the importance of

the voyages of the 'sixties and 'seventies in furnishing fresh stimulus and fresh material to the idealizers of primitive man; but he errs, as does Boswell, in forgetting that the enthusiasm aroused by these voyages constituted merely a new phase¹ of a development that had been continuous in Europe since the sixteenth century. A striking example of the false perspective resulting from this neglect of the earlier stages of the movement appears on p. 73. Here, apropos of the savage youth of Chili mentioned by Gray in the *Progress of Poesy* (wr. 1754), Professor Tinker writes: "With this figure it was far more difficult to deal than with the ancient bard because there was a total lack of acquaintance with the religion, folk-lore, and customs of the Malay, the African, and the American. The idealisation of the redskin belongs to a later generation."² Whatever may have been the case with the Malay or the African, the portion of this statement that concerns the American Indian is clearly the precise opposite of the truth. Professor Chinard, with whose books Professor Tinker seems not to be acquainted, has put the matter beyond question for France;³ and though we have as yet no studies comparable to his for England, it would not be difficult to draw up a long list of publications extending far back into the seventeenth century, in which eulogies of the natural virtues of the savages were combined with descriptions, some of them very elaborate, of their "religion, folklore, and customs."⁴ In short, all the evidence points to the conclu-

¹ Its newness, however, must not be exaggerated, for there are traces of idealization in a number of earlier accounts of voyages to the South Seas. See Dampier, *A New Voyage round the World*, London, 1697 (in *A Collection of Voyages*, London, 1729, I, 432-34); W. Funnell, *A Voyage round the World*, London, 1707 (*ibid.*, IV, 154, 159-60); and R. Walter, *A Voyage round the World in the Years MDCCXL, etc.*, by George Anson, Esq., second edition, London, 1748, pp. 411-22, 453.

² In his note to this passage, it is true, Professor Tinker acknowledges that the tradition of the "sentimentalised savage" was at least as old in England as Florio, but in the main body of his text he gives a very different impression. Cf. p. 64.

³ In his *L'exotisme américain dans la littérature française au XVI^e siècle* (Paris, 1911) and in his *L'Amérique et le rêve exotique dans la littérature française au XVII^e et au XVIII^e siècle* (Paris, 1913).

⁴ A very incomplete list of such publications, including both original English works and translations, is as follows: J. Acosta, *The naturall and morall Historie of the East and West Indies*, London, 1604 (in Book

sion that there was no "sudden revival of interest" in primitive man in the second half of the eighteenth century, but merely an extension and intensification, under somewhat changed conditions,

VI the author proposes to "confute that false opinion many doe commonly holde of them [the Indians], that they are a grose and brutish people"); M. Lescarbot, *Nova Francia: or the Description of that Part of New France, which is one continent with Virginia*, London, 1609 (cf. Chinard, *L'Amérique et le rêve exotique*, pp. 109-14); LasCasas, *The Tears of the Indians . . .*, London, 1656; other translations appeared in 1689 and 1699; Rochefort, *The History of Barbados . . .*, London, 1666 (see especially Book II, Chs. VIII and XI, and cf. Chinard, *L'Amérique*, pp. 54-57); Jean Mocquet, *Travels and Voyages into Africa, Asia, and America*, London, 1696 (cf. pp. 58, 72, 124-27); Lahontan, *New Voyages to North-America*, London, 1703; second edition, 1735 (cf. Chinard, *L'Amérique*, pp. 167-86); Robert Beverly, *The History and Present State of Virginia*, London, 1705; second edition, 1722 (Book III: "Of the Indians, their Religion, Laws, and Customs, in War and Peace"; conclusion (p. 63): "Thus I have given a succinct account of the Indians; happy, I think, in their simple State of Nature, and in their enjoyment of Plenty, without the Curse of Labour"); John Lawson, *A New Voyage to Carolina*, London, 1709; reprinted, 1714 and 1718 (cf. p. 177: the Indians are "some of the sweetest People in the World"; p. 197: they never envy other men's happiness, but have "something Valuable in themselves above Riches"; p. 235: they are "Patient under all Afflictions, and have a great many other Natural Vertues"); Lafitau, *Mœurs des sauvages américains*, Paris, 1724 (cf. Chinard, *L'Amérique*, pp. 315-26; apparently not translated, but widely read in England in the original: see *New Memoirs of Literature*, I [1725], 176-84, 241-56; Malcolme, *Essay on the Antiquities of Great Britain and Ireland* [1738]; Brown, *Dissertation on . . . Poetry and Music* [1763], pp. 29-36, 51, 62, 119; Percy, *Reliques* [1765], ed. Schröer, Berlin, 1893, II, 536; and Monboddo, *Of the Origin and Progress of Language* [1773-1792], IV, 41); B. Picart, *The Ceremonies and Religious Customs of the various Nations of the known World*, London, 1733-1739 (cf. III, 39: Indian poetry; 60-62: the Indians "follow nature more closely than we"; 67-69: their love of country); *A New Voyage to Georgia*, second edition, London, 1737 (cf. pp. 57-60: the virtues of the Indians which make them good subjects for conversion); C. Colden, *The History of the Five Indian Nations of Canada*, London, 1747 (enlarged from a work with a similar title printed at New York in 1727; describes the laws, customs, religious beliefs, and eloquence of the Indians; eulogizes their love of country, bravery, hospitality, and passion for liberty).—The poems in praise of the South Sea Islanders, of which Professor Tinker gives a partial list (pp. 10-11, 17, 87-88), had analogues in the first half of the century in a number of pieces inspired by the prevailing enthusiasm for the Indians: cf. for example, "The Happy Savage," in the *Gentleman's*

of an interest which had taken definite form several generations before.⁵

Though this is perhaps the most important instance of Professor Tinker's failure to place the facts with which he deals in their proper historical perspective, it is not the only one. The true significance, for example, of the enthusiastic reception given to Omai, the South Sea Islander brought to London in 1774 (pp. 75-88), would stand out more clearly if we were enabled to view his visit as simply one in a long series of similar visits which from the beginning of the century had afforded Englishmen a first-hand acquaintance with individual savages.⁶ So too with the

Magazine, II (1732), 718; Pope, *Essay on Man*, Ep. I (1733), ll. 99-112; Samuel Wesley (?), *Tomo Chachi, an Ode* (1736); and Joseph Warton, *The Enthusiast* (1744), ll. 232-44.

⁵ It is hardly correct to say, as Professor Tinker does, on p. 88, that the "noble savage" was the "offspring of the rationalism of the Deist philosophers, who, in their attack upon the Christian doctrine of the fall of man, had idealised the child of Nature." Not only did many of the most influential leaders of the Deist movement (Bolingbroke and Voltaire, for example) look upon the savages as far from ideal creatures, but the conception of the "noble savage" was itself fully formed long before Deism became a distinguishable movement. The influences under which it took shape are many of them still obscure, but the most important, aside from the universal human tendency to idealize the past and the strange, would seem to have been the popularity in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries of the medieval theme of the Terrestrial Paradise and still more of the classical theme of the Golden Age, the image of the simple life of the Hebrew patriarchs and of the primitive Christians, the vogue of Sparta and republican Rome, and the general inquietude which Europeans increasingly felt under the pressure of a civilization that was ever becoming more sophisticated and complex (see Chinard, *L'exotisme américain*, pp. xvi, 7-9, 11, 19, 26, 118, 120, 204, 245-46; *L'Amérique et le rêve exotique*, pp. 97, 431; and P. Van Tieghem, "L'homme primitif et ses vertus dans le Préromantisme européen," in *Bulletin de la société d'histoire moderne*, June, 1922, p. 215). Minds dominated by sentiments such as these were predisposed to take an optimistic view of primitive humanity, and it required only the contact with America to crystallize their vague feelings into a definite conception. It is interesting to recall, in view of Professor Tinker's theory, that the elaboration of this conception was in very large part the work, not of philosophers of any school, but of the Jesuit missionaries in New France (see Chinard, *L'Amérique*, pp. 122-50, 313-40).

⁶ It is sufficient to refer to the visits of four Iroquois chiefs in 1710 (see *The Four Kings of Canada. Being a succinct account of the Four Indian Princes lately arriv'd from North America*, London, 1710, and cf. Tatler,

theories of Lord Monboddó: his belief in the progressive decline of civilization (pp. 20-22) can be understood aright only when it is seen in relation to much earlier views on the "declining state of the world," of which it was merely a late survivor.⁷ These are sins of omission, and they can be forgiven in view of the popular and unpretentious character of the book in general. A more serious matter is Professor Tinker's treatment of what he terms the "very remarkable novelties" of Gray's *Progress of Poesy* (pp. 63-64). After quoting the well-known passage in which Gray sketches the "influence of poetic genius over the remotest and most uncivilised nations" (II, 2), he comments as follows: "Lapland and Chili in 1754! All this, we may well remind ourselves, is nearly twenty years before that renewal of interest in primitive man which ensued upon the explorations of the 'sixties, and which was discussed in the first of these lectures." The exclamation, however, is unnecessary, for, aside from the general fact that interest in Lapland and American, as well as in other forms of "primitive" poetry, was no new thing in 1754,⁸ the whole content of Gray's stanza and of his accompanying note is exactly paralleled in a work published more than twenty years previously. "Poetry," wrote John Husbands in 1731, "was not confin'd [in early times] only to the politer Nations. We may find some Remains of it among the most uncultivated People, and trace its Footsteps even beneath the Pole. The frozen *Laplander* is susceptible of this Fire, as well as the Sunburnt *American*. . . ."⁹

Other instances of the same tendency to neglect earlier developments might be pointed out, but these are perhaps sufficient to indicate wherein lies the chief weakness, for scholars, of Professor Tinker's interesting book. It is a weakness, let us hope, which in the future will be less apparent in writings on the later eighteenth

No. 171 and *Spectator*, No. 50), of seven Cherokee chiefs in 1730 (see V. W. Crane, in *The Sewanee Review*, January-March, 1919, p. 53), and of a group of Creek Indians in 1734 (see *Gentleman's Magazine*, IV, 449, 450, 571).

⁷ See R. F. Jones, "The Background of the 'Battle of the Books,'" in *Washington University Studies*, Vol. VII, Humanistic series (1920), pp. 104-16, and, on the classical origins of the idea, J. B. Bury, *The Idea of Progress* (London, 1921), Ch. I.

⁸ See *Mod. Lang. Notes*, XXXVII (1922), 35.

⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 30.

century than it has been in the past. In no period, of course, can we afford to shut our eyes to what has gone before, but there are few periods in which forgetfulness of the immediate or remote past is more fatal to an intelligent understanding of what was taking place than in that with which we are concerned in this book.

RONALD S. CRANE.

Northwestern University.

Les premières actrices françaises. Par LEOPOLD LACOUR. 8 gravures hors texte. Paris: Librairie française, 1921. 229 pp.

While in England French actresses were being "hissed, hooted, and pippin-pelted,"¹ they were establishing themselves in France as a permanent and increasingly important part of the troop. As much of the progress towards the commanding position they occupy today was made during the reign of Louis XIII, it was desirable that some one should devote a special study to those of them who gained recognition before he ceased to reign. M. Lacour has brought to the subject his very considerable knowledge of the stage, a charming style, and much ingenuity in putting together fragmentary information into a work that is highly entertaining and, in its principal elements, true. He has even endeavored to affirm nothing that will expose him "au démenti brutal d'un nouveau texte inédit" (p. 9), but here he has not altogether succeeded. While indicating the main subjects that he treats, I shall try to add a little information that he has overlooked and to correct a few of his details.

The first actress he mentions is Marie Ferré, who signed a contract at Bourges in 1545 to play in a strolling troop. He is careful not to assert that she was actually the first, and fortunately, for M. Cohen has recently shown that a girl named Waudru played in a mystery of 1501.² As there is very little information to be had about actresses of the sixteenth century, he soon passes on to the seventeenth and devotes a chapter to Marie Venier, dite Laporte,

¹ Prynne's *Histriomastix*, cited by Collier, *History of English Dramatic Poetry*, London, John Murray, 1831, II, 23.

² "Le livre du régisseur pour le Mystère de la Passion," *R. d. d. m.*, 15 mai 1923, p. 415.

the first Parisian actress of whom we have any record,³ and her sister Colombe, who was probably the mother of Montfleury. Some attention is paid to Italian actresses who performed in France, especially to Isabella Andreini.⁴ He thinks that Le Noir, famed for her "douceurs et gaillardises qui la rendent agréable à tout le monde," may have created the rôle of Thisbé in Théophile's tragedy. He is on surer ground when he refers to Villiers and Beauchâteau as the creators of the rôles of Chimène and l'Infante in the *Cid*. To these, to Valliot, Beaupré, La Fleur and other actresses he pays considerable attention, especially to Bellerose, wife of the leader of the troop established at the Hôtel de Bourgogne and called by Tallemant the best actress in Paris.⁵

The chief criticism I have to make of this portion of the book is that he often assumes, without sufficient evidence, that a certain woman played a certain rôle.⁶ One case deserves special attention. In seeking to determine what rôles were taken by Mlle Bellerose, M. Lacour (p. 126) cites a mazarinade of 1649, in which reference is made to "cette Cléopâtre, cette Rodogune, cette Impératrice de nos jours." It has been suggested that the plays referred to are Corneille's two tragedies, *Pompée* and *Rodogune*, and the conclusion has been drawn that the latter play was first acted at the Hôtel de Bourgogne. M. Lacour follows Marty-Laveaux⁷ both in accepting this suggestion as far as *Rodogune* is concerned, and in arguing that the Cléopâtre mentioned is the heroine of Benserade's play of that name, first acted fourteen years before and now presumably revived to furnish a rival to the heroine of *Pompée*. But M. Lacour has overlooked the fact that, as *Pompée* had been printed in 1644, there was nothing to prevent its being acted by the troop of the Hôtel

³He thinks that "selon toute probabilité" there were scarcely any actresses at Paris before the reign of Henry IV, though they had long been applauded in the provinces (p. 5), but he gives no proof of this distinction.

⁴He might have called attention to the poem addressed to her by Isaac Du Ryer, in which he reminds her that "Paris vaut bien l'Italie." Cf. *Le Temps perdu*, Paris, 1610.

⁵To the information given about her he might have added that Mahelot requires for the playing of *La Florice* by Passar "une lettre a Mademoiselle de Bellerose," which shows her importance in the troop and that she was acting at the Hôtel de Bourgogne early in 1634.

⁶Cf. pp. 78, 84, 140.

⁷*Œuvres de P. Corneille*, iv, 56; cf. also 407.

de Bourgogne, and, indeed, the second list of plays in the *Mémoire de Mahelot*,⁸ which gives the repertory of the Hôtel de Bourgogne in 1646-1647, mentions *Pompée* and *Rodogune*, but says nothing about the *Cléopâtre* of Benserade. Mlle Bellerose must have been known in 1649, then, as the heroine of Corneille's recent and famous tragedy rather than of Benserade's antiquated play. On the other hand, the rôle of Rodogune, if it is that of an empress, as the mazarinade implies, must come from the *Rodogune* of Gabriel Gilbert, rather than from Corneille's tragedy of the same name and theme, for in the latter play Rodogune is a young princess, not an empress as in the former. Since these two plays were obviously written for rival theatres, one must conclude that, contrary to the general opinion, Corneille's *Rodogune* was first played, like most, if not all its predecessors, at the Marais. If Mlle Bellerose played in it at all, it was probably several years later,⁹ when Gilbert's play had been withdrawn and Corneille's introduced into the repertory of the Hôtel de Bourgogne. And when she did, she probably took the part of the empress, not that of Rodogune.

M. Lacour holds that, as early as 1615, there were no troops in France without several actresses (p. 28). If this is so, how does he explain the assertion that the *suivante*, played by a woman, did not replace the *nourrice*, played by a man, till some 15 years later?¹⁰ The dates assigned to plays by Mairet and Corneille (pp. 59, 71-77) are too precise for the evidence at our disposal. It is misleading to give to Hardy's plays, even with question marks, the absurd dates of the frères Parfaict (p. 194). *Sophonisbe* is said not to figure in the *Mémoire de Mahelot* (p. 81). It could not be included in the first list of plays given there, which was completed before this play was acted, but it is included in the second, that of 1646-47, and may have formed part of the repertory of the Hôtel de Bourgogne long before that date. The third list in *Mahelot* confirms M. Lacour's opinion that Tristan's *Mariane* was ultimately played at the Hôtel de Bourgogne (p. 92). The argument for

⁸ Cf. my edition, Paris, Champion, 1920, pp. 50-56.

⁹ It is idle to argue, as Marty-Laveaux does, that Gilbert's play must have been forgotten five years after it was acted, for Mahelot shows us that the same author's *Téléphonte* was still in the repertory of the Hôtel de Bourgogne at least that long after it was first played.

¹⁰ Cf. the preface to Corneille's *Galerie du palais*.

dating the first representation of *Pyrame* 1625, even if it has the approval of M. Lachèvre (p. 52), is far from convincing. The fact that it appeared in a *recueil* proves nothing at all for this period. We certainly know too little about plays that were acted and printed between 1620 and 1625 to assume that a play that had been represented was always published "dans un volume qu'elle remplissait entièrement avec les 'proses' ou les vers qui la concernaient." Théophile, like Hardy, had written for the stage before he published the bulk of his work. It is probable that *Pyrame* was one of these plays and I see no objection to accepting for its date 1621, a year in which Théophile was in favor at court and which would allow for the usual period that elapsed between the representation and publication of a play.

After discussing the actresses, M. Lacour treats of the first *spectatrices*, the interest taken in the theater by the queen¹¹ and other great ladies, and the manner of acting and reciting during the period beginning with 1630 when there was a marked improvement in the quality of plays and of acting so that "les femmes les plus chastes et modestes" came freely to the theaters of Paris. He believes that the elocution was much less declamatory than later writers, especially Molière and Voltaire, have led us to suppose. Here, as elsewhere, the work is full of interesting suggestions, supported by considerable documentary evidence. The book, in spite of much that is conjectural, can be profitably consulted by specialists and will represent to the general public an interesting chapter, not only in the history of the stage, but in that of the development of feminism, for here we find women early in the seventeenth century taking a more important position in one department of human activity than she occupies even today in many others.

H. CARRINGTON LANCASTER.

¹¹ Like Dr. van Roosbroeck (*The Purpose of Corneille's Cid*, Minneapolis, 1921, 20-24), though independently, M. Lacour believes that Corneille was made a noble at the request of Anne of Austria, but M. Batiffol has more recently opposed this opinion, holding that in 1637 the queen "n'était en mesure de solliciter pareille faveur ni pour Corneille ni pour personne"; cf. "Richelieu a-t-il persécuté Corneille," *R. d. d. m.*, 1 avril 1923, pp. 634, 641, 642.

Geschichte der deutschen Literatur in ihren Grundzügen. Von O. E. LESSING. Dresden: Carl Reissner, 1921. 345 pp.

Although some three years have elapsed since the appearance of this work, written in German and published abroad, but coming from the pen of an American scholar who for more than twenty years has expounded German literature in American higher institutions of learning, it has received but scant notice in this country. Hence it is felt that even at this comparatively late date some remarks on the book may not be out of place.

A new history of German literature at this time evokes first of all the question: What specific purpose prompted the author to write? The fact that the book lacks even the semblance of a critical apparatus and deals after all in a cursory manner with its subject shows that it was not intended primarily as a scholarly contribution. Nor is it certain that its author meant it to be used as an academic reference work; it is doubtful whether in America, at least, it could be made to fit into the scheme of an ordinary survey course.¹ Most probably, then, it was planned as a general treatise for the lay reading public.

The title of the book is rather misleading. While professing to be a *Geschichte der deutschen Literatur in ihren Grundzügen*, it stops short at Goethe's death without a word of explanation anywhere. It would be absurd to assume that Professor Lessing considers German literature as ending at that period. Not only has the author previously shown an interest in more recent literature (*Grillparzer und das neuere Drama*, 1905, and *Masters in Modern German Literature*, 1912), but in the very book under discussion he makes repeated and favorable reference to later authors and movements. Or is a second supplementary volume to appear later? If so, this should have been noted. Whatever the facts may be, the failure to indicate in a proper place that the book ends with the year 1832 is indefensible from a scientific point of view and unfair to the unsuspecting purchaser.²

¹ A special edition of the book appeared simultaneously for America, but textually it is identical with the original edition.

² Wilhelm Scherer could hardly be cited as a precedent here. He states in the preface to his *Geschichte der deutschen Literatur*: "Das vorliegende Buch erzählt die Geschichte der deutschen Literatur von den ältesten Zeiten bis auf Goethes Tod." Furthermore Scherer, writing some forty

A preface is lacking, and the only clues to the nature of the work are in the descriptive phrase of the title, *in ihren Grundzügen*, and the Shakespearean motto from *Coriolanus*, II, 3:

What custom wills, in all things should we do't,
The dust on antique time would lie unswept,
The mountainous error be too highly heaped
For truth to o'er-peer.

This is quoted in German. But the reader who concludes from the motto that the book presents its subject from any polemic, iconoclastic or essentially new angle will be disappointed. On the whole the treatment is quite conventional and follows well beaten tracks.

Professor Lessing begins his work with the migration of nations, the christianization of "Germany" and the oldest monuments. However, Wulfila is mentioned only twice, in a most casual way (pp. 10, 12), and the significance of his Gothic Bible as the oldest Germanic document is not touched upon. Tacitus is referred to only in connection with Klopstock's *Bardiete* (p. 155). The *Merseburger Zaubersprüche* and the *Wessobrunner Gebet* are not treated, while the importance of the cycles of *Volkssagen* and *Märchen* is scarcely alluded to.

Professor Lessing's method of giving information and his selection of facts seem rather arbitrary and eclectic. In the early chapters, for instance, he devotes very little attention to the manuscripts, their provenience and present location. Thus little or nothing along these lines is said about the *Hildebrandslied*, the *Heliand*, *Muspilli* and *Otfried*, but when we reach the *Carmina Burana* (p. 37), this question is dealt with. Mention of the so-called Archipoeta in connection with the *Carmina Burana* is misleading. He is rarely mentioned at all in books of this scope.

When, on the other hand, we consider the type of reader that Professor Lessing must have had in mind, we feel that he leaves many things unexplained that would call for elucidation. He

years ago, actually carries his subject as a whole down to, and even beyond, Goethe's death by considering Romanticism, Kleist, Heine, Rückert, Grillparzer and others of that period. Professor Lessing closes his general consideration of authors with the eighteenth century and carries only the discussion of Schiller and Goethe further.

speaks of the "alliterierende Langzeile" (p. 11), the "Stabreime der Langzeile" (p. 15) and "altgermanische Metrik" (p. 15) as familiar phenomena. He aptly emphasizes the significance of *Meistersang* in bringing plain citizens together in literary clubs for the purpose of transcending the prose of their humdrum existence (p. 74), but no one unfamiliar with the movement could gain even a rough conception of its nature by reading this book. Similarly the *Englische Komödianten* are merely mentioned (p. 110).

Many of Professor Lessing's comparisons and observations are very apt but often hackneyed. He calls attention to the value and interest that *Ruodlieb* would have had for the early Romanticists as supporting their theories (p. 24). He compares Walther von der Vogelweide with Goethe as a lyric poet but finds him more akin to Schiller in the sensuousness of his language, more of an observer than a creator, who lacks the mystic, vulcanic, incalculable elements of Goethe (p. 44). He compares Wolfram's *Parzival* with a Gothic cathedral in its variegated splendor (p. 59). The character and literary influence of Erasmus remind him (as they have reminded others) of Voltaire (pp. 82-83) and Gottsched's position from 1730 to 1740 suggests a comparison with Dr. Johnson in England (p. 126). Klopstock's *Messias* is well but again conventionally described as a sort of oratorio rather than an epic (p. 150).

Gottsched is treated in an altogether moderate and fair manner. His contribution in arousing the spirit of nationalism in Germany (pp. 126-127) and his efforts toward giving the *Schriftsprache* a firmer footing in Catholic South Germany and Austria are rightly stressed. Herder's *Ideen* are described as the classical expression of the theories of Storm and Stress. In the section on Storm and Stress it is refreshing to find a very good, adequate treatment of Klinger (pp. 212-222), who is so often neglected in works of similar scope. It is unusual that Wieland is discussed before Lessing. Similarly in the earlier section Gottfried von Strassburg precedes Wolfram.

Other random points that may deserve notice are the following. The definition of *Leich* (p. 43), although bringing out the force of the Gothic *laiks* (dance), does not do full justice to the influence of the modulations of the liturgic Halleluja (the sequences).

Heinrich von Meissen (Frauenlob), one of the customary links between minnesingers and mastersingers, is not mentioned. The part played by Emperor Maximilian I. personally in writing at least a first draft of *Teuerdank* is not made clear (p. 86). The great philological importance of the editions of Luther's Bible published during the century after Luther's death is not brought out. Murner, certainly one of Luther's bitterest enemies, is not treated in connection with Luther at all, but twenty pages earlier in connection with Brant. Schottel's name does not occur; together with Leibnitz's *Unvorgreifliche Gedanken* (p. 121) the same writer's previous *Ermahnung an die Teutsche, ihren Verstand und Sprache besser zu üben* might well have been referred to. None of the plays of Gryphius is mentioned by name. The point of division of the last two major sections of the book (on the pre-classical and classical periods), the year 1775, while serviceable, is somewhat arbitrary and disruptive.

It is an inconsistency to leave unexplained such a title as Pauli's *Schimpf und Ernst* (p. 111) while elucidating the title of Freidank's *Bescheidenheit* and others. In a number of places (p. 39, beginning at line 12 from bottom; p. 46, beginning at line 12 from bottom; p. 272, beginning at line 6; and p. 293, beginning at line 15) passages from other writers are quoted without giving the source.

There are also incongruities in the spelling of proper nouns and titles. Professor Lessing has followed no fixed practise here and the result is sometimes disturbing. Latin, pseudo-Latin, old Germanic and modern German forms occur indiscriminately. Thus he writes *Wulfila* (pp. 10, 12); *Roswitha* (p. 17); *Hiltgunde* (p. 18); *Eckehard* (p. 18); *Heinrich der Glichesare* (p. 30); *Thomasin von Zirclaria* (p. 46); *Condwiramurs* (p. 54); *Neidhart von Reuental* (p. 45); *der Hürnen Siegfried* (p. 74); *Sachs's Wittenberger Nachtigall* (p. 102) (why not *Wittenbergische*? Sachs wrote *Wittembergisch*); and *Christoph* (i. e., *Christoffel von*) *Grimmelshausen* (p. 117). The author also speaks of Hutten's *Klag und Vermahnung gegen den . . . Gewalt des Bapsts* (p. 100). But Hutten wrote: *Clag und vormanung gegen dem*, etc., so that Professor Lessing's version is neither Hutten's, nor a close approximation of it, nor modern German. We find also *Discourse der Malern* (p. 131) (*Mahlern* in the original, *Maler* in N. H. G.).

Misprints are as follows: read *wer des* (or *dessen*) *vergäss* for *wer das vergäss* (p. 44); *Godfrey of Monmouth* for *Godfrey of Monmoth* (p. 48); *Reynke de Vos* for *Reynke des Vos* (p. 75, margin); *Enea Silvio* (the form preferred by the author) for *Enea Sylvio* (p. 84); *Lukian* (the form preferred by the author) for *Lucian* (p. 84, line 3 from bottom, and p. 163); *Euphuismus* for *Euphonismus* (p. 112); *August Hermann Francke* for *August Hermann Franke* (passim); *understanding* for *understanting* (p. 119, line 3 from bottom); *Titel* for *Tittel* (p. 307). Finally Shaftesbury's essay (p. 169) *A Notion* (not *Nation*) of the historical Draught or Tablature of the Judgment of Hercules appears not in the *Characteristics*. It is a separate treatise.

EDWIN H. ZEYDEL.

Indiana University.

French Literature during the Last Half-Century. By PIERRE DE BACOURT and J. W. CUNLIFFE. New York: The MacMillan Company, 1923.

Cet ouvrage constitue un guide des plus utiles pour le lecteur américain qui veut trouver un fil conducteur pour se diriger dans l'étude de la production littéraire de la France depuis la guerre de 1870. Il est d'autant plus précieux qu'à ma connaissance il n'existait sur cette période, ni en anglais, ni même en français, d'ouvrage aussi complet et aussi bien informé.

Le manuel de MM. de Bacourt et Cunliffe se compose en réalité de deux parties fort distinctes. Après un chapitre d'introduction qui a pour objet d'indiquer les principaux courants d'idées qui se manifestent pendant la période étudiée, viennent douze chapitres, ou plutôt douze essais, consacrés aux auteurs qu'à tort ou à raison MM. de B. et C. considèrent comme les maîtres du chœur. On trouvera donc les chapitres que l'on attendait sur Zola, Maupassant, Daudet, Loti, Anatole France, Bourget, Barrès, Rostand, Maeterlinck. On sera peut-être un peu surpris de voir mettre au rang de ces protagonistes Brieux, seul des dramaturges contemporains qui avec Rostand ait été jugé digne d'une étude particulière, et encore plus Charles Maurras et Romain Rolland. Dans les derniers chapitres, qui ont pour titre *The symbolist movement; Con-*

temporary poetry; Contemporary drama; The new novel, les auteurs ont tracé dans des cadres dont eux-mêmes reconnaissent l'incertitude, le développement de différents genres jusqu'à l'année présente, et s'efforcent de déterminer les courants et les tendances qui se manifestent dans la littérature d'aujourd'hui. A la fin de chaque chapitre, une bibliographie sommaire mais suffisante donne une liste chronologique des ouvrages étudiés, et des indications sur les traductions en anglais des principaux écrivains de cette période.

Avant de passer au détail, une remarque sur la composition de l'ouvrage s'impose. On voit immédiatement le défaut de la méthode adoptée par MM. de B. et C. La forme de l'essai qu'ils ont préférée, pour la première partie de leur travail, les a conduits à négliger des courants d'idées et des genres littéraires que l'on s'attendait à voir au moins notés, en passant, dans une étude de ce genre. C'est ainsi que l'on ne trouvera rien sur les orateurs, les historiens, les philosophes, les écrivains scientifiques, et ce qui est plus surprenant, rien sur la critique. Jules Lemaître est mentionné comme "one of the most sensible and sensitive critics of our time" dans le chapitre sur le *Psychological drama*, où une personne non prévenue ne songerait guère à aller le chercher. On ne trouvera rien non plus sur Brunetière dont le rôle n'a pourtant pas été négligeable. Dans un ouvrage de ce genre il était nécessaire de faire un choix; mais si le livre de MM. de B. et C. est destiné aux étudiants aussi bien qu'au grand public, l'addition d'un chapitre sur la critique semble s'imposer. Dans l'ensemble, les jugements portés sur les auteurs étudiés sont empreints d'une grande modération et d'une remarquable impartialité. A la fin du chapitre sur Zola, on trouvera indiqués en quelques lignes des renseignements utiles sur l'influence que Zola a exercée sur certains écrivains étrangers. Il est curieux qu'on ne trouve point indiqué un seul auteur américain. Les noms de Frank Norris et d'Upton Sinclair, pour n'en citer que deux, auraient pu au moins être donnés.

Dans les chapitres à titres généraux, remplis de faits et de noms, il y aurait à la fois à ajouter et à retrancher. Ne pouvant étudier, même brièvement, tous les écrivains contemporains, MM. de B. et C. ont fait un choix qui par endroit peut être discuté. Était-il bien utile de donner les noms de MM. Mandelstamm, Maurice Leblanc et Gaston Leroux pour dire que leur œuvre n'appartient pas à la littérature et de passer sous silence des écrivains tels que

E. Le Roy, Louis Pergaud, Maurice Maindron et Jules Renard et Estaunié. Je ne me permettrai pas de mettre en doute l'assertion que, dans le roman, les femmes écrivains sont "at any rate the equals of men"; mais on peut au moins se demander s'il était bien utile d'encombrer la bibliographie de la liste complète des ouvrages de Gyp, Jane Marni et bien d'autres dont les chances de survie littéraire sont décidément faibles. On peut regretter qu'un chapitre spécial n'ait pas été consacré au régionalisme, un des mouvements littéraires les plus importants des trente dernières années. Il m'est assez difficile de souscrire au paragraphe consacré à René Boylesve qui semble indiquer que MM. de B. et C. attribuent à la *Leçon d'amour dans un parc*, qui n'est ni le meilleur ni le plus connu des ouvrages de Boylesve, une importance hors de proportion avec la production totale de l'écrivain. Un certain nombre de fautes matérielles dues sans doute au compositeur disparaîtront dans une nouvelle édition. Je signalerai cependant l'orthographe Viau au lieu de Viaud pour le nom patronymique de Pierre Loti qui revient de façon constante dans le chapitre qui lui est consacré. Il est également à souhaiter que dans une nouvelle édition les auteurs donnent un index plus complet.

GILBERT CHINARD.

Johns Hopkins University.

CORRESPONDENCE

AN ARTHURIAN PARALLEL

One of the best known of the stories associated with King Arthur is that which tells how, just before his death, he sent Bedevere to throw Excalibur back into the lake whence it came, and how when Bedevere finally did throw in the sword a hand came up out of the water and caught it. A very curious parallel to this story exists in Welsh folk-lore, but the resemblance has never, so far as I know, been pointed out. The story as told by William Davies¹ in his collection of the folk-lore of Merionethshire is as follows:

"It is said that Hugh Llwyd² had two daughters; one of an

¹ "Casgliad o Len-Gwerin Meirion," in *Cofnodion a Chyfansoddiadau Buddugol Eisteddfod Blaenau Ffestiniog*, 1898. (Transactions of the National Eisteddfod of Wales, 1898.) Liverpool, 1900. P. 222.

² A Welsh poet (1533?-1620) who acquired among his neighbors the reputation of a magician and about whose name a considerable number of stories gathered.

inquisitive turn of mind like himself, while the other resembled her mother, and cared not for books. On his death-bed he called his learned daughter to his side, and directed her to take his books on the dark science and throw them into a pool, which he named, from the bridge that spanned the river. The girl went to Llyn Pont Rhyd-ddu with the books, and stood on the bridge, watching the whirlpool beneath, but she could not persuade herself to throw them over, and thus destroy her father's precious treasures. So she determined to tell him a falsehood, and say that she had cast them into the river. On her return home her father asked her whether she had thrown the books into the pool, and on receiving an answer in the affirmative, he, inquiring whether she had seen anything strange when the books reached the river was told that she had seen nothing. 'Then,' said he, 'you have not complied with my request. I cannot die until the books are thrown into the pool.' She took the books a second time to the river, and now, very reluctantly, she hurled them into the pool, and watched their descent. They had not reached the water before two hands appeared, stretched upward out of the pool, and these hands caught the books before they touched the water, and clutching them carefully, both the books and the hands disappeared beneath the water. She went home immediately, and again appeared before her father, and in answer to his question, she related what had occurred. 'Now,' said he, 'I know that you have thrown them in, and I can now die in peace,' which he forthwith did."

Although the resemblance between these two stories is apparent, the exact relationships are by no means clear. Obviously the literary version, being older than the time of Hugh Llwyd, cannot have been taken from this folk-tale, yet it is difficult to believe that if the story had once been known to the people in connection with King Arthur, it would have been disassociated from him and linked up to a much less famous character, especially in a region where stories about Arthur still exist in popular tradition.³ In all probability both versions of the story represent an earlier tale which in time was attached to the Arthur cycle and so got into literature, but which also continued to exist in its earlier form so that it could be attributed to Hugh Llwyd as well as to Arthur. This process would be very similar to what seems to have taken place in the old story of the warriors sleeping in a cave waiting until it should be time for them to awake and save their native

³ According to local tradition Arthur was born in the parish of Llanuwellyn, and now sleeps in a cavern near Bala; Llyn Llydaw into which his sword Excalibur was thrown is not far away, and the tomb of the giant Rhitta, slain by Arthur, is on the top of the near-by Snowdon. There are still other references to Arthur and his men in the neighborhood. Davies, *op. cit.*, 84 ff., and John Rhys, *Celtic Folklore Welsh and Manx*, Oxford, 1901. II, 476, 478.

land. Sometimes their leader is Arthur, sometimes he is Owen Lawgoch; Professor Rhys⁴ believes that he has found evidence that both have taken the place of an earlier divinity about whom the story was originally told.

JOHN J. PARRY.

University of Illinois.

SOME NOTES TO A NOTE

In *Modern Language Notes*, xxxviii, 140 ff., Professor Herbert D. Austin develops the interesting theory that Dante, preoccupied with the stupendous transition from the material universe to the spiritual, which he was preparing to describe in Canto XXX, shows throughout the *Paradiso* what Professor Austin variously terms a "quirk," an "inversion bias," or "a whimsical predilection for the concept of reversed direction."

It is, of course, conceivable that Dante was suffering from some sort of an inside-out complex, but Professor Austin's evidence is hardly conclusive, and the skeptic will remain with some justice unconvinced.

In the first place, it was not necessarily a "quirk of Dante's imagination" that was "responsible for those two odd conceits" in *Paradiso*, II, 23-24, and XXII, 109-110. Was it not rather his normal use of a standard trope in medieval rhetoric, familiar to him both from his formal studies in the *Trivium* and from his eager private conning of Virgil? Unquestionably, he knew Servius's commentary on his *Maestro*, and even if he would by himself have passed over Vergilian phrases such as "moriatur et in media arma ruamus" (*Aeneid*, II, 353) without notice, Servius forcibly drew his attention to the fact that this, like other phrases, did not result from any "inversion bias" in the mind of Vergil, but was simply an example of the well-known rhetorical figure *hysteron proteron*. And a medieval student would have so glossed Dante's "Tu non avresti in tanto tratto e messo Nel foco il dito . . ."; recognizing *hysteron proteron*, both here and in the cross-bow passage, as readily and as naturally as his twentieth-century ectype spots an accusative with the infinitive construction.

Later Professor Austin stresses the fact that in Dante's upward journey he has a vision of each of the three Persons of the Trinity. "and these are presented in *the reverse of the canonical order!*" But can this be seriously regarded as a case of inversion? One hardly needs to point out that only if the vision of God the Father had been revealed to the ascending Dante in the lower heaven,

⁴ *Op. cit.*, II, 493.

the Son in the higher, and the Holy Spirit in the highest could there really be a question of reversal.

Again, "Quell' uno e due e tre che sempre vive/e regna sempre in tre e 'n due e 'n uno, . . ." is called "a formula that reverses the Trinity most effectively and simply." Yet, if the phrase does imply any such reversal (and the nature or even the possibility of a reversed Trinity is not quite clear), it was St. Athanasius, or rather the unknown author of the *Quicunque vult*, and not Dante who was primarily responsible for the somewhat unorthodox operation. Dante was really doing little more than translating and expanding a familiar phrase from the well-known *Symbolum Sancti Athanasii*,¹ which might be found in any medieval breviary: "Ita ut per omnia . . . et Unitas in Trinitate et Trinitas in Unitate veneranda sit."

And again, it is difficult to accept the "suggestion of reversal" which Professor Austin finds in Dante's interesting description of the sound-waves passing from Beatrice in the center of the spirit circle to St. Thomas on the circumference, and those passing from St. Thomas on the circumference to Beatrice in the center. The theory of sound-waves and the comparison to ripples on the surface of water Dante found, as is well known, in Boethius's description "Quis modus sit audiendi";² and there is surely no "inversion" or "reversal" in this particular application of them, except in so far as some such idea is implicit in every question or observation and reply. It is almost as if Professor Austin had added up the sum of Dante's usages of the prefix *ri* (note the striking number of *risposte* throughout the *Commedia*!) as evidence of his "whimsical predilection for the concept of reversed direction."

Much of Professor Austin's evidence for Dante's inversion bias, then, seems open to serious question. And, in conclusion, we cannot help regretting that (on p. 142) the aristocratic name and title of that gallant old hero, the Baron Munchausen, are suppressed by a passing reference to him as "the hunter," and his famous wolf is metamorphosed to a bear. *Sic transit gloria mundi!* or, as Dante puts it, "O vanagloria dell'umane posse!"

WALTER L. BULLOCK.

Bryn Mawr College.

¹ The *Athanasian Creed* of the modern Anglican Prayer-book.

² *De Institutione Musica*, I, 14.

A CORRECTION

In the *M. L. N.* for February my treatise, *Hebbel, Ibsen and the Analytic Exposition*, is accorded a "Brief Mention," in the course of which the reviewer makes certain statements I should like to comment on. He says I assume that literary criticism "generally accepts Ibsen as the introducer of this method of analytic exposition," whereas in reality I say that the analytic exposition is "generally supposed to have been introduced into modern drama by Ibsen"—a vital distinction. (I was also fully aware of the few exceptions to this assertion: Fr. Th. Vischer, some special students of Hebbel and Schiller, and Henderson among the Americans). After this the reviewer proceeds with his argument on the further incorrect idea that my book, too, ignores, or practically ignores, the analytic exposition in Greek drama, and thus he (wrongly) attributes to me the same fallacy which he (wrongly) assumes I attribute to literary criticism. On this basis he quotes Gottschall and Steiger to set me right. But as I neither assume that Ibsen introduced the method *into drama*, nor that literary criticism assumes this, all this argument of the reviewer is to no purpose. He must have been misled by his overlooking the words, *into modern drama*, in the one instance, and in the other instance by a statement of mine that there are traces of the analytic exposition in *German drama before Hebbel*. He reasons as if I had said there were only traces of it in *Greek drama*.

In his next paragraph the reviewer remarks: "In discussing the work of the two dramatists from the angle of exposition, Professor Campbell's little book, then, restates certain facts already known, but succeeds notably in presenting a clear outline of the expository form as illustrated in the dramatic practice of the various centuries." If by "expository form" the reviewer means the method of exposition, he is giving me credit for notable success in something I do not attempt. As to the "facts already known" that I am said to restate, he nowhere specifies them. He could hardly mean the fact that the analytic exposition was employed in ancient as well as in modern drama, for he argues above as if I had not taken that sufficiently into account.

While in his concluding sentences the reviewer touches upon the real theme of my treatise, he might have pointed out more clearly its main constructive propositions, which are: That the analytic exposition in modern drama finds its explanation in the problem the dramatist faced of showing the influence of environment in the shaping of character, within the time limits imposed by the stage; and that Hebbel, because of the importance he attached to the *Werden* of his characters, naturally hit upon this solution.

T. M. CAMPBELL.

Wesleyan University.

ON THE ORIGIN OF THE SHELLEY SOCIETY
(POSTSCRIPT)

By the first and fifth paragraphs of Professor Newman I. White's reply¹ to my criticism of his article on *Shelley's Debt to Alma Murray*, in which reply he frankly admits the validity of certain of my objections, I believe my inquiry² has been justified, at least as far as the accuracy of those statements is concerned. But as he and I remain at variance on the subject of the comparative importance of the *Hellas* performance (to which Professor White made only a passing reference in his first article); the size of the *Cenci* audience; the purpose or purposes for which the Shelley Society was formed, its fruits, and its lease of life, I feel obliged to reënter the lists in behalf of a more accurate understanding of these matters.

"The *Cenci* performance," writes Professor White, "likewise was ambitious in that it was an effort to settle a disputed point, namely, the acting qualities of the play, whereas the *Hellas* performance was apparently of interest principally from a musical point of view, which had no such close relationship to Shelley's reputation as poet or dramatist." It is interesting to note that the originator of the Society held quite a different view. In a postscript accompanying a four-page leaflet on the forthcoming *Cenci* performance, issued by the Shelley Society in April, 1886, Dr. Furnivall presented this request to the membership of the society:

Not by authority of the Committee, but of myself, I ask my fellow-members for help to produce Shelley's *Hellas*, with Dr. Selle's music and choruses, and recitations by good actors, in November next. I am sure that every member of the Society would like to see and hear the *Hellas* soon, and to signalize the Society's first year's work by the performance of both Shelley's great Tragedies, as well as the issue of a dozen publications.³

In this statement we may observe that Dr. Furnivall pledged the interest of the entire society in the production of *both* of Shelley's "great tragedies" in the same year; and suggested that the *Hellas* should be presented not only for the sake of Dr. Selle's music and choruses, but with "recitations by good actors." It is clear that Dr. Furnivall did not make the mistake (which one

¹ *M. L. N.* XXXIX, pp. 18-22.

² *M. L. N.*, XXXVIII, pp. 159-64.

³ *Shelley Society. Performance of The Cenci, &c. (pamphlet)*, 1886, p. 3. The Secretary's letter to the membership, opening the pamphlet, substantiates, by the way, Mrs. Alfred Forman's statement (recorded by Professor White in a footnote to his original article) that May 7th "was chosen as a compliment to Robert Browning" whose birthday it was.

unfamiliar with the Greek tragedies, Shelley's models, might) of thinking that *Hellas*, actually written as "a sort of imitation of the *Persae* of Aeschylus,"⁴ was conceived as an opera rather than as a drama in the Greek manner, and that therefore interest in its production, in London, would center about the incidental music furnished by Dr. Selle, "an old-fashioned musician of the Stern-dale Bennett school."⁵

As a matter of history, too, I must insist that the attendance (which I cannot agree with Professor White in considering "a trivial criterion" of the importance of this production) at the *Cenci* performance in all probability did not exceed 2300, since the Grand Theater at Islington seated only 1957 persons.⁶ This fact was my reason for selecting "the lowest figures cited for the *Cenci* performance."

If as he pleads, "it makes no difference" whether Genevieve Ward or her friends "attempted to organize a private production" of *The Cenci* a few years before the Shelley Society's performance of the play, I suppose that his original statement that Miss Ward had herself "attempted to organize a private production" need hardly be called in question. Exercising the same latitude, Professor White may also be allowed to refer to the production of *The Cenci* as "the avowed primary purpose" of the organization, and chief reason for the cohesion of the Society during 1886, although as I have shown, other avowed purposes were given equal emphasis in the early announcements of the Society—purposes realized later by the efforts of the whole group.

Looseness in one statement easily leads to looseness in many; and we are not therefore surprised to discover that in his latest article Professor White refers to the late Edward Dowden as the "author" of Shelley's review of Thomas Jefferson Hogg's *Memoirs of Prince Alexy Haimatoff*, which originally appeared in the *Critical Review* for December, 1814, and was reprinted by the Shelley Society in 1886 under the editorship of Mr. Thomas J. Wise.

"It appears," asserts Professor White, in the same article, "that the last paper delivered in the Society and subsequently published was delivered in 1888." Unfortunately again, extant evidence destroys the theory. On June 26, 1889, the Reverend Stopford Brooke addressed the Society on the subject: "Some Remarks Upon the Lyric Poetry of Shelley"⁷ which were published in his *Studies in Poetry* (2nd imp., 1908.⁸ On November 12, 1890,

⁴ Shelley to John Gisborne, Oct. 22, 1821. *Letters of Shelley*, ed. Ingpen, 1914, p. 920.

⁵ *Notebook of the Shelley Society*, 1888, p. 81.

⁶ *Shelley Society. Performance of the Cenci*, p. 2.

⁷ *Shelley Society Notice* (1 p., n. d.) signed by Mr. Wise as Secretary.

⁸ Pp. 144-175.

Mr. W. E. A. Axon read a paper on "Shelley's Vegetarianism" before the Society,⁹ and this was subsequently published in pamphlet form,¹⁰ without date. On December 10, 1890, Mr. W. M. Rossetti presented before the membership an essay on "The Shelleys Near Geneva; Dr. Polidori's Diary"¹¹ which was printed, with alterations, as an Introduction to his edition of Dr. Polidori's Diary,¹² in 1911.

WALTER EDWIN PECK.

College of Wooster.

BRIEF MENTION

Curiously enough the oldest collections of edifying and entertaining stories were those in Latin made in the later Middle Ages for the use of preachers. For convenience of reference these collections were arranged alphabetically according to topics, and soon led to imitations in the modern languages, such as *An Alphabet of Tales* (E. E. T. Soc., 1904-5), the Catalan *Recull de Eximplis*, Barcelona, 1881-84, the Spanish *Libro de los Exemplos* edited by Gayongos and Morel-Fatio, etc. The original Latin collections were made primarily for edification and it was not until the close of the Middle Ages that collections in Latin and the modern languages were made for the purpose of general entertainment, although the element of edification was by no means lacking. The most extensive and famous of these modern collections are Johannes Pauli's *Schimpf und Ernst*, 1522 and Kirchoff's *Wendunmut*, 1563, both accessible in Oesterley's editions in the publications of the Literarischer Verein of Stuttgart. The edition of Pauli was published in 1866, and, like that of Kirchoff, 1869, is invaluable for the mass of references to sources and imitations gathered by the learned editor. Since the date of Oesterley's edition a large and important literature has grown up in regard to mediæval tales and their diffusion, and many collections of texts have been published. It was a happy thought of the Berlin publisher Herbert Stubenrauch to undertake a new edition of Pauli and to entrust its preparation to the scholar best fitted

⁹ Calendar of the Shelley Society's Session, 1890-1, pub. in *Sh. Soc. Papers*, Pt. II.

¹⁰ *Shelley's Vegetarianism*, by William E. A. Axon, F.R.S.L., etc., pp. 13.

¹¹ *Op. cit.* in note 9, above.

¹² *The Diary of Dr. John William Polidori, 1816. Relating to Byron, Shelley, etc.*, Edited and Elucidated by William Michael Rossetti, London, 1911.

for the work, Dr. Johannes Bolte. The new edition, the first part of which is before us, forms the first volume of: *Alte Erzähler neu herausgegeben von Johannes Bolte, Erster Band, Johannes Pauli, Schimpf und Ernst, Erster Teil*, Berlin, Herbert Stubenrauch Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1924. The title page of the first part adds: *Die älteste Ausgabe von 1522*. The work is beautifully printed on excellent paper, in quarto form, pp. 36, 418. The second part will contain indexes, a history of the work and its diffusion, the nine *märlein* or stories contained in Pauli's sermons, and the sources and parallels completing, and enlarging Oesterley's edition. The first part contains the text of the oldest edition with an important introduction on Pauli's life and writings. As the reviewer hopes to notice at greater length the completed work, he will remark here briefly that the dates of Pauli's birth and death are lacking, but he was born probably between 1450-1454, and was not living in 1533. His life was spent largely in Alsace where he was a member of the Franciscan order and active as a reader (Lector), preacher and confessor in various cloisters of his order. He collected and published the sermons of Geiler von Keisersberg as well as some other works of this famous preacher. Pauli's fame, however, rests upon his *Schimpf und Ernst*, a collection of six hundred and ninety-three stories, of which about a third are serious, the rest jocose (*Schimpf* = *Scherz*). In the course of time the serious character of the work receded more and more into the background. The idea came to Pauli, as Bolte thinks, while he was editing Geiler's sermons (over a hundred passages from which are found in *Schimpf und Ernst*) or making from Geiler's stories and the Latin *exempla*-literature of the Middle Ages a work at once edifying and entertaining which should find its readers less among the monastic officials than among the inmates of the cloisters and the laity. The arrangement is in groups divided according to the various classes of society (priests, monks, judges, landlords, maidens, fools, etc.) and moral ideas (truth, lies, avarice, idleness, adultery, alms, honoring father and mother, etc.). These divisions are, however, purposely jumbled together. Bolte enumerates briefly in his introduction Pauli's sources. Among these are the well-known mediæval treatises for the use of preachers, such as Bromyard's *Summa predicantium* (from which over a hundred stories are taken), the *Scala Celi* of Johannes Gobii Junior, etc.; classic authors such as could be found in Valerius Maximus, Aesop's fables and Cato's distichs, and oral tradition and personal experience. Pauli has used his material freely as can be seen by a comparison of his stories with their originals in Bromyard, for instance. In this huge work the enormous number of stories are given in the driest and most concise form. Pauli expands these sketches and gives them literary life.

Again scholars owe a debt of gratitude to Dr. Bolte and the publishers who in these difficult times can find readers for such substantial works.

T. F. C.

Les techniques de la critique et de l'histoire littéraires en littérature française moderne. By Gustave Rudler. Oxford: Clarendon Press and New York: Oxford University Press, 1923. xv + 204 pp. M. Rudler's first task should have been to explain why he thought there was still need for his book after the appearance of Morize's *Problems and Methods of Literary History*, but no such explanation is given. He merely lists the latter work with others at the end of his preface. Indeed he implies that he completed his preface before he knew that Morize had written, for he dates it Dec. 20, 1922 and *Problems and Methods* 1923, although the latter appeared in December, 1922 and, as Morize tells me, a copy of it was received by R. while he was preparing his own book, which appeared only in December, 1923. The error in the date assigned to Morize's work is, of course, unintentional, but it is most unfortunate that such an essential date should be given incorrectly at the beginning of a treatise intended to teach "the best technical methods." Moreover the preface ought to be almost the last thing a scholar writes. A paragraph could surely have been inserted during the course of the year 1923, stating to what extent R. believed he was adding to the work of his predecessor.

As both authors are French literary historians of distinction, belonging to the same school and teaching in leading Anglo-Saxon universities, the similarity that exists between their doctrines, their methods, even their illustrations may often be explained as due to a common experience, but at times the resemblance is so close that, unless he is warned by the author, the reader may believe it due to direct borrowing. For instance, in the chapters on attribution each writer selects his three leading examples from articles concerned with Diderot's *Paradoxe*, Pascal's *Discours sur les passions de l'âme*, and La Boétie's *Contr'un* and gives them, in both cases, in this order, which is the reverse of the chronological. R. makes no mention of M. in this chapter, an omission that is hardly atoned for by the inclusion of M.'s name among those of whom it is said that "d'excellents, de remarquables travaux ont été menés à bien par de très jeunes gens" (p. 201).

M.'s book is more complete in its information about bibliography, biography, versification, and chronology. There is little to choose between the chapters in the two books on sources, attribution, and influence. R. adds considerably to M. in what he has to say about collation (pp. 60-80), in his chapter on *critique générale* and in most of that devoted to *critique de genèse* (pp. 140-155); also in

his two concluding chapters on *critique sociologique* and *critique psychologique collective*, which will, however, be of more interest to the mature scholar than to the beginner in literary history.

M. has a much broader point of view with regard to other fields than modern French literature, other literary historians than French. A student is apt to think, if he reads only R., that the study of modern French literature in the last thirty years owes nothing to work done in Old French, in the classics, and in other modern literatures, also that almost all students of French literary history are Frenchmen, surely a discouraging suggestion for R.'s students at Oxford. Work done by Italians and Germans is almost entirely ignored. Even such important bibliographical journals as *ZRPh.* and *JRP.* are left unmentioned, except for a general reference to Lanson's *Manuel*. Native Americans fare a little better, for Thieme, Gayly, and Kurtz are referred to, a college text by Oliver, and an article in *RHL.* by Blossom. Few Englishmen are named, but, doubtless to compensate for this neglect, frequent reference is made to at least one resident of England, to M. Rudler himself. He mentions ten of his published books and articles and several others that are yet to appear. Some of these references are doubtless justified, but R.'s article on *Andromaque* (mentioned on pp. 122, 131, 157) is no proper example of "critique de genèse." I should hesitate even to refer to it in the chapter on sources, for, where there are so many articles that might be cited, why select one which, while containing an interesting suggestion, "n'a rien de définitif"?

It is amusing to find in a book that contains no index the following word of counsel (p. 13):

Il est désirable que tout livre soit suivi d'un index des personnes citées et des matières; sans quoi, tout ce qui n'est pas l'objet propre et direct de l'ouvrage se trouve perdu."

It is inadvisable to discuss Bovet's book (pp. 35, 36), unless one warns students against a theory that pays so little attention to fact as to consider the epic the predestined *genre* for French literature between 1610 and 1715. Rigal's article on *Ruy Blas* was excellent at the time it was written, but, as he gave the *Lady of Lyons* rather than the life of Angelica Kauffmann as one of its chief sources and as he knew nothing of Victor Hugo's own statement as to how the idea of the play came to him, it is not to be selected as a model of "critique de genèse."

Despite these defects, however, there is much that is excellent in the book. It gives the graduate student sound advice as to the aims and methods of literary history, and this advice is clearly presented, with interesting illustrative examples. As I have pointed out, several chapters may be read with profit even by a student who is well acquainted with Morize's book. Both works should be in the libraries of all universities giving graduate work in modern French literature.

H. C. L.

The Troubadours and England. By H. J. Chaytor. (Cambridge University Press, 1923. 164 pp.) We are quite accustomed, of course, to finding the sources of mediæval English poems in Anglo-Norman or northern French originals. For nearly three hundred years after the Conquest, French was the language not only of the king of England and the nobility, of the law courts and the pulpit, of commerce and the guilds, but, naturally enough, of polite literature and, to a great extent, of minstrelsy. So close indeed were the literary connections between England and France in the early Middle Ages that it is sometimes difficult to decide whether a given work was first written down on the island or on the continent.

Mr. Chaytor, however, is interested not so much in establishing the well-documented interrelations between England and northern France, as in trying to find out—a far more difficult task—to what extent the English lyric was influenced by that distinctive product of southern France, the courtly songs of Provence. He admits frankly that such traces of Provençal influence as he discovers may have reached England indirectly through northern poets rather than directly from southern France, but he shows that there was at least sufficient commercial and political intercourse between England and Provence in the Middle Ages to have made the more direct route a possibility.

He proceeds to point out that one or two of the troubadours actually visited England and that others came into contact with the English court on the continent. Some twenty-eight troubadours mention English affairs in their poems. Turning from external to internal evidence, the author examines both English and Anglo-Norman lyrics, and finds in them stanzaic structure, rhyme schemes, *genres*, and certain forms of thought that are peculiarly characteristic of the songs of the troubadours. He realizes, of course, that the relative poverty of rhymes in English makes exact parallels for the more complicated Provençal rhyme schemes difficult to discover, and that "the spirit of the Middle English lyric is not that of the troubadours," but he concludes from the varied evidence he has assembled that English lyric poetry owes a considerable debt to the poets of Provence.

This conclusion may not have equal weight with all critics. The subject has by no means been exhausted in this slender volume, and, as the author suggests, a comparison of the melodies in the Provençal and English manuscripts may well throw further light upon it. The detailed and impartial presentation of the material, however—and Mr. Chaytor does not stretch his hypotheses—is in itself a distinct contribution.

G. F.